UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

"Furbish'd Remnants": Theatrical Adaptation and the Orient, 1660-1815

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English

by

Angelina Marie Del Balzo

2019

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

"Furbish'd Remnants": Theatrical Adaptation and the Orient, 1660-1815

by

Angelina Marie Del Balzo

Doctor of Philosophy in English

University of California, Los Angeles, 2019

Professor Felicity A. Nussbaum, Chair

Furbish'd Remnants argues that eighteenth-century theatrical adaptations set in the Orient destabilize categories of difference, introducing Oriental characters as subjects of sympathy while at the same time defamiliarizing the people and space of London. Applying contemporary theories of emotion, I contend that in eighteenth-century theater, the actor and the character become distinct subjects for the affective transfer of sympathy, increasing the emotional potential of performance beyond the narrative onstage. Adaptation as a form heightens this alienation effect, by drawing attention to narrative's properties as an artistic construction.

A paradox at the heart of eighteenth-century theater is that while the term "adaptation" did not have a specific literary or theatrical definition until near the end of the period, in practice adaptations and translations proliferated on the English stage. Anticipating Linda Hutcheon's postmodernist theory of adaptation, eighteenth-century playwrights and performers conceptualized adaptation as both process and product. Adaptation created a narrative mode that emphasized the process and labor of performance for audiences in order to create a higher level of engagement with

audiences. Bringing together theories of emotion by philosophers such as Adam Smith and David Hume, and modern performance studies scholarship, I demonstrate how competing discourses of sympathy produced performance practices that linked stronger emotional response with theatrical artifice.

One of the major changes in English stage adaptations**,** I contend, is a new emphasis on strong emotion and a new set of strategies for rendering feeling onstage. The Restoration tragedy's emphasis on pathos significantly preceded the cult of sensibility expressed in the sentimental novel, as shown by Elkanah Settle's transformation of the character Roxolana from virago to tragic heroine in his stage adaptation of Madeleine de Scudéry's novel *Ibrahim*. Reading the English translations of Voltaire's Oriental tragedies, I illustrate how the metatheatrical distance created by and eighteenth-century stage practices and Orientalist settings increases the opportunity for sympathetic exchange, by offering both the character and the performer as recipients simultaneously. This expansive vision of emotional sharing enlivens tragedy, but it also opens up the more dangerous possibilities of an uncontrollable contagion of feeling at a historical moment when contact with strangers increases. The exotic settings in adaptations of the *Arabian Nights'* frame tale of Scheherazade paradoxically domesticate these stories of marital cruelty, unfamiliar aesthetics on top all-too-recognizable sexual violence. At other moments in the period though, as in John O'Keeffe's adaptation of "The Little Hunch-Back," those blurred boundaries between individuals and nations enable cross-cultural sympathetic identification along with their exoticism. In adaptations portraying the Orient, these settings provide a reflexive space for eighteenth-century English texts to explore questions of genre, nation, and feeling as British imperial power expanded but before European hegemony was a foregone conclusion.

The dissertation of Angelina Marie Del Balzo is approved.

Helen E. Deutsch

Sarah Tindal Kareem

Emily Hodgson Anderson

Felicity A. Nussbaum, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation exists because of the material and emotional support from my friends, family, and academic community. Words fail to describe how fortunate I have been in my dissertation committee. Felicity Nussbaum's reputation as a researcher is matched only by her dedication to graduate mentorship, and I am deeply thankful for her time and energy. Her high expectations have made me a better writer and thinker, but I especially appreciate the compassion she has extended to me in moments of personal difficulty. I am indebted also to Helen Deutsch, who has always made me feel like she is in my corner. Her theoretical acuity has opened up unexpected avenues in my thinking and also inspired my first major project in graduate school. Our conversations have always simultaneously helped me think through tough questions as well as make me laugh. Thank you to Sarah Kareem for making me a Hume enthusiast despite my initial skepticism, for the advice given in many moments of confusion and insecurity, and for the best sloth care package a broken foot ever received. Emily Anderson's work organizing the Long 18th-Century Colloquium has introduced me to the amazing southern California eighteenth-century community and she and Sarah have both served as models of how to be a kind and empathetic academic.

Other academic support has come from Lowell Gallagher and Joseph Bristow who generously offered an out-of-field student time during the difficult first years of the program. Thank you to Eugenia Zuroski for providing professional and karaoke opportunities. This research has been funded by the Center for 17th- and 18th-Century Studies and the William Andrews Clark Library at UCLA, the Raymond Klibansky Collection Research Grant at McGill University, and the UCLA-Université François Rabelais de Tours exchange project. The UCLA Department of English has provided many opportunities to present this work to different audiences, and the participants in the 18th-Century/Romantics Working Group, 19th-Century Group, Early Modern Reading Group, and the Winter Athenaeum have all provided invaluable feedback. I would not have become a scholar if

it wasn't for my professors at Wellesley College, especially to Yoon Sun Lee and James Noggle for introducing me to the eighteenth century, and to David Ward and Nora Hussey for their long-term support. Thank you also to my high school English teacher June Yi, who first believed I could become a professor.

It is rare to find a graduate student community as supportive as the one at UCLA. I've benefitted by the mentorship of eighteenth-centuriests Julia Callendar, Cailey Hall, Alex Hernandez, James Reeves, and especially Katie Charles and Taylor Walle. Thank you also to Nevena Martinović, my CSECS eighteenth-century theater buddy. Outside of the field, I am happy to count as friends Ben, Kaitlyn, Simon, and Lois Beck, Ellen and John Truxaw Bistline, Will Clark, Vanessa Febo, Jay Jin, Kim Hedlin, Robin Kello, Kirsten Lew, Efren Lopez, Jen and Haig McGregor, Craig Messner, Crescent Rainwater, Kiel Shaub, Sam Sommers, Gregory Toy, and Alexandra Verini. The drinks out, theater and movie events, homemade dinners, tearful phone calls, group texts, and Bachelor Nights have meant the world to me. Thank you the Sunset crew: Emily Davis, Justeen Kim, Katie Litvin, Betty Song, and Jasmine Wang; my Wellesley women: Claire Ayoub, Torie Doherty Munro, Stephanie Gomez Menzies, Nohemi Maciel, Jizhou Wang; and the Pommies: Johanna Arenillas, Nora Fulvio, Satomi Ginoza, Sua Im, Lisa Snider Jacobson, Alice Lo, Laura Marrin, and Elaine Wong. Special thanks to Appy Ayyagari for being my LA rock. My love to Daniel Fujimoto, still.

My grandparents Mario Eugene and Joyce Del Balzo and Albert and Rosaria Nozzi have inspired me with their belief in value of education. *Vi voglio bene*. Thank you to my extended family of aunts, uncles, and cousins for continually bringing me joy, and especially to Nicole Nozzi for sharing the California doctoral journey with me. Finally, I would be nothing without my Mama and Papa Mary and Carl Del Balzo, who have always been my biggest advocates. To my sister Sara: I knew before you were born that having a sister would be the best, and I'm happy to have been proven right. I love you three so much.

VITA

EDUCATION

M.A. 2015, C.Phil. 2016	English, University of California, Los Angeles
B.A. *cum laude* 2011	English with honors and Italian Studies, Wellesley College

PUBLICATIONS

"'The Feelings of Others': Sympathy and Anti-Semitism in Maria Edgeworth's *Harrington*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 31, no. 4 (2019): 685-704.

"The Sultan's Tears in *Zara*, an Oriental Tragedy." *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 55, no. 3 (2015): 501-21.

Performance Review of *Everything That Never Happened*, by Sarah B. Mantell, directed by Jessica Kubzansky, Boston Court Pasadena. *Shakespeare Bulletin*. Forthcoming.

Review of *In Praise of Fiction: Prefaces to Romances and Novels, 1650-1760* by Baudouin Millet (Peeters, 2017). *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 30, no. 4 (2018): 598-601.

SELECT AWARDS, GRANTS, AND FELLOWSHIPS

2018-2019	Graduate Division Dissertation Year Fellowship, UCLA
2018	Helene W. Koon Memorial Award, Second Prize, Western Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies
2018	Grace M. Hunt/English Reading Room Fellowship for Archival Research, UCLA
2017-2018	Collegium of University Teaching Fellows, UCLA
2017-2018	Department of English Dissertation Year Fellowship, UCLA
2017	Université François-Rabelais de Tours/UCLA Exchange
2016-2017	Clark Dissertation Fellowship, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library
2016	Raymond Klibansky Collection Research Grant, McGill University
2013-2015	Summer Research Mentorship, UCLA
2012	Ruth Ingersoll Goldmark Fellowship, Wellesley College
2011	Elizabeth Robinson '78 Italian Senior Essay Prize, Wellesley College
2011	Laura Sperazi Award for Service, Wellesley College

SELECT PRESENTATIONS

March 2019	"Our English Mode: Representing Performance in the Theatrical Prologue," American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies Annual Conference, Denver, CO
Jan. 2019	"'Female Suff-rers': Adapting *Ibrahim* and Emotion on the Restoration Stage," Modern Language Association Annual Convention, Chicago
June 2018	"'Ultra-orientalists' and the *Arabian Nights* on the London Stage," City, Space, and Spectacle in Nineteenth-Century Performance, University of Warwick in Venice, IT
Feb. 2018	"Heads and Maidenheads: Scheherazade in the Eighteenth Century," Winter Athenaeum, UCLA Dept. of English
April 2016	"Limping Witches: Colley Cibber's *Richard III* and the Untimely Deformed Woman," Disability and Shakespearean Theatre Symposium, Glasgow, UK
Oct. 2015	"'Secure from All Sympathy:' Affect and Anti-Semitism in Maria Edgeworth's *Harrington*," Canadian Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies Annual Conference, Vancouver, BC
Dec. 2014	"The Sultan's Tears: Metatheatricality and Affect in Oriental Tragedy," David Nichol Smith Seminar in Eighteenth-Century Studies, Sydney, AU

Introduction

Adaptation and Eighteenth-Century Empire

Furbish'd Remnants argues that eighteenth-century theatrical adaptations set in the Orient destabilize categories of difference, introducing Oriental characters as subjects of sympathy while at the same time defamiliarizing the people and space of London. Looking at plays adapted from both prose and other plays, in addition to select prose adaptations, this project emphasizes the importance of historicizing adaptation, which has continued to be theorized through a presentist lens. Applying Enlightenment theories of emotion along with modern adaptation theory, I contend that in eighteenth-century theater, the actor and the character become separate objects of sympathy, increasing the emotional potential of performance beyond the plot presented onstage. Adaptation as a form heightens this distance, by drawing attention to the performance's properties as an artistic construction, rather than a reflection of nature. In adaptations portraying the Orient, these settings provide a reflexive space for eighteenth-century English texts to explore questions of genre, nation, and feeling as British imperial power expanded but before European hegemony was a foregone conclusion.

A paradox at the heart of eighteenth-century performance studies is that while the term "adaptation" did not have a specific literary or theatrical definition until near the end of the period, in practice adaptations and translations proliferated on the English stage. The reliance on revivals and adaptations emerged in part from the historical and economic circumstances of the moment: the loss of a generation of playwrights during the Civil War, the creation of the patent theater monopoly in the Restoration, and the 1737 establishment of state censorship. Anticipating contemporary adaptation theory, eighteenth-century playwrights and performers theorized adaptation as both process and product, often employing metaphors of dress and manufacturing as refurbishing older garments in the prologues and epilogues that metatheatrically contextualized the play for audiences.

Adaptations created a mode for drama that did not hide from audiences the process and labor of performance, but rather emphasized it in order to create a higher level of engagement with audiences. While nineteenth-century bourgeois realism sought to suspend the audience's disbelief, the eighteenth-century theater anticipated Brecht's alienation effect in their metatheatrical practices, believing that audiences became participants when the artifice of theater was brought to the forefront.

Contemporary and Eighteenth-Century Adaptation Theory

This project uses modern definitions as its theoretical framework as a way to think about eighteenth-century adaptation not just as an editorial product, but also as an ongoing process that reveals an active engagement with both the works themselves and with their own contemporary moment. Adaptation Studies as an academic field began with film, arguably with George Bluestone's *Novels into Film* (1957). As that title suggests, the scholarship that followed focused on cinematic adaptations, centered on the perceived fidelity or lack thereof to the literary source. The focus on this particular medium has necessitated a presentist focus to the field, as it excludes adaptations produced before the invention of audio and visual recording. The two major journals on adaptation, both founded in 2008, each take one of these approaches to the field. *Adaptation*[1] follows paths set by Bluestone, focusing on adaptations of literature into film and television (and vice versa). *The Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance*,[2] by focusing on performance mediums, both recorded and live, seeks a greater transhistorical lens, but at least the last three volumes of the journal have exclusively discussed twentieth- and twenty-first-century adaptations. Similarly, the special issue of

[1] *Adaptation: The Journal of Literature on Screen Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): http://www.adaptation.uk.com/journal-of-adaptation-studies/

[2] *The Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance* (Bristol: Intellect): https://www.intellectbooks.com/journal-of-adaptation-in-film-performance

Theatre Journal on adaptation also privileged contemporary adaptations of older sources.[3] But as much as adaptation theory remains focused on the present, it is equally a truism in adaptation studies that the practice goes back to Shakespeare's plots and before.[4] What remains then is a need to historicize both how adaptation, in our definition, was practiced and theorized in periods before recording and also what the term "adaptation" meant to previous periods specifically, and the ways in which those two bodies of thought interact.

Central to most modern theories of adaptation is that it is both a process and product, a noun and a verb.[5] In her 2006 *A Theory of Adaptation*, postmodernist critic Linda Hutcheon attempted to create a definition of adaptation that dehierarchizes the relationship between adapted text and source, and that is applicable across different media forms. She presents three different definitions for adaptation: 1) a "formal entity or product, an announced and extensive transposition of a particularly work(s)"; 2) "a process of creation, [that] always involves both (re-)interpretation and then (re-)creation"; and 3) a "process of reception [and] a form of intertextuality."[6] As we have noted, adaptation is, according to these descriptions, both the process and the product. The word itself needs context to be correctly read in its process or product form, just as the audience or artist must "hold to contradictory ideas (something new, something familiar) in mind at the same time."[7] As Julie Sanders argues in *Adaptation and Appropriation*, the way adaptation continuously reads two or

[3] Joanne Tompkins, ed., special issue of *Theatre Journal* 66, no. 4 (2014): 499-654.

[4] In her conclusion, Linda Hutcheon briefly mentions that Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* is an adaptation of "Arthur Brooke's versification of Matteo Bandello's adaptation of Luigi da Porto's version of Masuccio Salernitano's story of two very young, star-crossed Italian lovers (who changed names and place of birth along the way);" Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 177.

[5] Jane Barnette, *Adapturgy: The Dramaturg's Art and Theatrical Adaptation* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2017), 18.

[6] Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 7-9.

[7] Barnette, *Adapturgy,* 18.

more texts simultaneously can help illuminate the choices made in all artistic creation: "the relevance of particular terms to a specific text and the moment in time when these become active culturally can provide some very focused clues as to a text's possible meanings and its cultural impact, intended or otherwise, and the purpose behind an act of adaptation."[8]

Neither Hutcheon nor Sanders considers theater's specific role in adaptation, which Jane Barnette addresses directly in her recent book *Adapturgy: The Dramaturg's Art and Theatrical Adaptation*. Barnette theorizes how dramaturgy (the term coined by G.E. Lessing for the analysis of dramatic composition) and adaptation share "a practice that makes the past present; dramaturgy does so by articulating how and why a historical event matters to today's spectators, while the adaptation reframes a previously created source anew. Adapturgy traffics in re-presentation."[9] Theater as a live, embodied medium has different implications for the study of adaptation. Famously, Peggy Phelan argued that "performance's being…becomes itself through disappearance."[10] Hutcheon's definition of adaptation as "the simple act of almost but not quite repeating, in the revisiting of a theme with variations" can be a way of describing all dramatic performance, as Jane Barnette points out; without recording, a complicated factor as performance studies turns towards "liveness," no theater production is the same every performance. But rather than make all theater into adaptation, rendering the term nonsensical, Barnette instead reframes adaptation's dual definition: as a noun, adaptation means theatrical works based on another text; as a verb, adaptation is a form of dramaturgy. This does not just address theater's absence in adaptation theory; rather, performance is central to theorizing adaptation per se.

---

[8] Julie Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 23.

[9] Barnette, *Adapturgy*, 36.

[10] Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 146.

In literary studies, adaptation is often placed under the umbrella of intertextuality, the understanding of texts as a network of meaning, and the view that interpretation involves tracing the meanings between texts. With the recent turn in adaptation and translation studies away from hierarchizing source texts over their adaptations, intertextuality serves as a useful framework because its theorists look at textual relationships in a more expansive way. First introduced by Julia Kristeva, intertextuality comes from her reading of Bakhtin, where she frames all text as a form of adaptation: "Any text is a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another. The notion of *intertextuality* replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least *double*."[11] Intertextuality moves the discussion of adaptation away from being a separate line of inquiry; if all texts are the transformation of other texts, then adaptations are more transparent versions of the process: all texts are created in language, which gains meaning through usage, and so all texts are reflections of prior works. While Kristeva's view of intertextuality imagines a more diffuse relationship between texts, Gérard Genette's structuralist version, which he calls transtextuality, focuses on the ways in which a text is set in relation to other texts,[12] and offers a more material examination of those relationships. Specifically relevant to adaptation is his notion of hypertext, a text united in any way to an earlier text that is not commentary.[13] While Kristeva's conceptual and Genette's material frameworks refocus attention away from film studies' fidelity criticism or the privileging of authorial intent, adaptation names a specific kind of relationship I am defining here as a cultural product conceptually based on another artistic work: so while adaptation

[11] Julia Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue, and Novel," *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Tori Moi, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 37.

[12] Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, trans. Channa Newman and Claude Dubinsky (Lincoln, NE: Nebraska University Press, 1997), 1.

[13] Genette, *Palimpsests*, 5.

is an intertextual/transtextual process, not all discussions of intertextuality and transtextuality are about adaptations.

Another form of intertextuality with a contested relationship to adaptation is translation.[14] Hutcheon includes translation under the rubric of adaptation, a move that is more in line with the eighteenth century's transcultural aesthetic theories than the contemporary academy's disciplinary boundaries: "In shifting cultures and therefore sometimes shifting languages, adaptations make alterations that reveal much about the larger contexts of reception and production,"[15] which becomes especially illuminating with transcultural adaptations. The demarcation between translation and adaptation is arguably impossible to distinguish even now; by default, translation is the adapting of text to an entirely different language and cultural system. Walter Benjamin's description of translation, like Hutcheon's and Sanders' theories of adaptation, looks for an explicit signaling of the text's status as translation: "A real translation is transparent; it does not cover the original, does not block its light, but allows the pure language, as though reinforced by its own medium, to shine upon the original all the more fully. This may be achieved, above all, by a literal rendering of the syntax which proves words rather than sentences to be the primary element of the translator. For if the sentence is the wall before the language of the original, literalness is the arcade."[16] This idea seems to require almost Brechtian alienation; the translation should not include specific idiosyncrasies from the second language, but should maintain the syntax of the original, even if it makes for an awkward product.

---

[14] Lawrence Venuti, "Adaptation, Translation, Critique," *Journal of Visual Culture* 6, no. 1 (2007): 25-43.

[15] Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 28.

[16] Walter Benjamin, "The Task of the Translator," *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken, 1968), 79.

Roman Jakobson defines three different kinds of translation: 1) intralingual translation or rewording, "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language"; 2) interlingual translation or translation proper, "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language"; and 3) intersemiotic translation or transmutation, "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems."[17] For both Hutcheon and Jakobson, adaptation and translation are both processes and products. Translation therefore not only includes reworking texts within the same language, but also includes adaptations of texts to other communication systems such as music and dance. Adaptation is then a form of translation, in the way it interprets a text regardless of any language difference in the original and the secondary text. When translation occurs between two European nations with an extended history of political and cultural exchange, the interacting cultures have a less stable relationship, one that is made increasingly complicated by burgeoning European empires.

Adaptation describes a point of cultural contact, whether intra or intercultural, and so it is no coincidence that the proliferation of adaptations and translations on the eighteenth-century stage coincided with the first English imperial century, when Britain controlled the transatlantic slave trade and began its colonial project in both hemispheres. Much contemporary adaptation theory resonates with feminist, postcolonial, and critical race theory. In the Fall 2018 special issue of *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Nile Green asks, "Can one write about the eighteenth century without empire?" With the global turn of eighteenth-century studies, it has become increasingly difficult to answer anything but "no." An overview of adaptation theory similarly begs the question: can one write about adaptation without empire? Many of the key adaptation concepts coined by Linda Hutcheon and Julie Sanders, including "indigenization," "appropriation," and "hybridity," are terms

[17] Roman Jakobson, "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," in *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 145.

in postcolonial studies as theorized by Edward Said and Homi Bhaba, among others. Adaptation can be included under the umbrella of intertextuality, as discussed earlier, which developed through French philosophers trained in anthropology, an imperialist discipline: Julia Kristeva herself was trained by Claude Lévi-Strauss, whose application of structuralist linguistic theory to anthropology was rooted in his field work in Brazil. This project historicizes both processes, adaptation and empire, within eighteenth-century theories of the emotions, as English anxieties around theatrical form and the potential loss of true English feeling mapped onto contradictory feelings about Britain's expanding global reach.

The political potential in adaptation emerged from feminist and postcolonial critics drawing attention to the ways in which women and colonial subjects engaged with the literary tradition. Both Sanders and Hutcheon cite Adrienne Rich's term "re-vision" in the development of their theories. Re-vision is a specifically feminist version of writing that looks to other works within the patriarchal literary tradition: "Re-vision—the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new critical direction—is for us more than a chapter in cultural history: it is an act of survival."[18] Adaptation can be away of "re-vising" more directly; it can engage with other texts in order to critique the preoccupations or examine ideas on the margins of the source text. Like hypertextuality, re-vision sketches a direct relationship between texts rather than intertextuality's less causal format: full appreciation of the text would require familiarity with its predecessor. Re-vision also makes room for non-normative voices to be heard through an active engagement with preceding sources. Like re-vision, appropriation is a form of adaptation whose political meaning is often in the foreground. "Appropriation" for Sanders is defined by audience reception, the term for adaptations that do not openly declare themselves as such. But in postcolonial and critical race theory appropriation refers to the dominant culture's co-option of practices and imagery from the

[18] Adrienne Rich, "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision," *College English* 34, no. 1 (1972): 18.

less powerful. While adaptation studies attempts to create apolitical definitions of these terms, their application cannot be separated from the power relations between texts. While appropriation describes an exploitative way to perform adaptation, Rich's re-vision offers a proscriptive vision of the subversive potential of adaptation. The popularity of postcolonial, queer, and feminist re-writes of classics speaks to the potential that adaptation offers both artists and audiences.[19]

Indigenization is another concept from anthropology[20] that has become a part of adaptation theory, one that charts the specific ways in which a source is adapted. Hutcheon's concept of "indigenization" is a specific process of intercultural interaction: "In shifting cultures and therefore sometimes shifting languages, adaptations make alterations that reveal much about the larger contexts of reception and production."[21] The various ways of indigenizing a story include historicizing or dehistoricizing, racializing or deracializing, and embodying or disembodying the source material.[22] Indigenizing is an imperial process, as the literary product of a region with growing European coercive influence is appropriated for English narrative. In translation studies, Lawrence Venuti describes the similar processes of "domestication" and "foreignization:" the former describes translations that render texts in terms familiar to the readers' context while the latter preserves or emphasizes the places of cultural difference.[23] Venuti's definition points to the stakes of indigenization in adaptation. Domestication can render the process of translation (or adaptation)

---

[19] For example, Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (1611) has been frequently adapted with these approaches, including Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969), Derek Jarman's *The Tempest* (1979), and Marina Warner's *Indigo* (1992).

[20] "Indigenization is often a product of collective and spectacular experiments with modernity, and not necessarily of the subsurface affinity of new cultural forms with existing patterns in the cultural repertoire." See Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 90.

[21] Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 28.

[22] Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation*, 158.

[23] Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 18.

invisible, which Venuti argues upholds normative cultural readings. It also presumes a universal humanity, that there is a base experience that all cultures share. In contrast, foreignization has the potential to resist the universalization of the culture being translated into by heightening difference, and can also resist normalizing the cultural context of the translated product.

While adaptation remained untheorized in the 1700s, eighteenth-century artists and critics extensively theorized the process of translation. Anticipating Jakobson's schema of translation, John Dryden cites three types of translation: 1) metaphrase, or "turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another"; 2) paraphrase, or "translation with latitude, where the author is kept in view by the translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly followed as his sense; and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not altered"; and 3) imitation, "where the translator (if he has not lost that name) assumes the liberty, not only to vary from the words and sense, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion; and taking only some general hints from the original, to run division on the groundwork, as he pleases."[24] The ideal translation follows the second definition, where the translator is to retain the spirit of the original but not at the expense of clarity. The third definition, which is barely admitted into the definition of translation, is more in line with adaptation in that the original is the means for the production of another literary work. I include translation theory in this discussion of eighteenth-century adaptation for two reasons. For one, this approach to translation, which attempted to interpret the source for a new cultural context without betraying the spirit of the original, is similar to how many modern critics like Sanders would define adaptation, as I will discuss below. For another, crucially, the processes that modern critics would characterize as two separate categories (adaptation and translation) were described with the

[24] John Dryden, preface to *Ovid's Epistles* (1680), in *The Works of John Dryden*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker and H.T. Swedenberg, Jr. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956), 114.

same set of metaphors in the prologues introducing plays of either type, suggesting that these were theorized together, not as two fundamentally different processes.

Despite his critique, Dryden is not entirely opposed to the idea of creative translation or adaptation, for "to be a thorough translator, he must be a thorough poet."[25] For Dryden, there is an element of reciprocity in translation: "Seek a Poet who your way does bend / And choose an author as you choose a Friend."[26] The embodiment of the source text as a living author highlights the process of translation over the product, a frame that does not draw attention to the elevated status of classical texts. Johnson writes on translation in his preface to "Dryden" in *The Works of the English Poets* (1779): "When languages are formed upon different principles, it is impossible that the same modes of expression should always be elegant in both. While they run on together the closest translation may be considered as the best; but when they divaricate each must take its natural course. Where correspondence cannot be obtained it is necessary to be content with something equivalent."[27] This is an exercise in moderation, in remaining faithful to both the integrity of the original work and the meaning of the new version. In Alexander Pope's formulation, "it is not to be doubted, that the fire of the poem is what a translator should principally regard, as it is most likely to expire in his managing: however, it is his safest way to be content with preserving this to his utmost in the whole, without endeavoring to be more than he finds his author is, in any particular place."[28] While Dryden, Pope, and Johnson are primarily concerned with classical translation, Aphra Behn's "An Essay on Translated Prose" specifically addresses the translation of modern languages (in

[25] John Dryden, "Preface to *Sylvae*," in *Of Dramatick Poesy and Other Essays*, ed. George Watson, 2 vols. (London: Everyman's Library, 1967), II. 20.

[26] Dryden, "Essay on Translated Verse," II.95-6.

[27] Samuel Johnson, "Prefaces to the Works of the English Poets: Dryden," in *The Major Works*, ed. Donald Greene (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 723.

[28] Alexander Pope, "Preface" in *The Illiad of Homer* (London: 1715), xlii.

particular French) into English,[29] arguing that both linguistic origins and cultural similarities renders the process of translating more or less difficult. Eighteenth-century translation theory becomes both a help and a hindrance to the process of adaptation: while absolute fidelity is neither expected nor welcomed in translation, neither are any innovative interpretations, or major shifts in form.

Other adaptive genres of the period including imitation, travesty, and plagiarism include the artist's (author or performer) positionality in their defining characteristics. Originating with the *imitatio* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, imitations were popular throughout the eighteenth century with writers such as Joseph Addison, Matthew Prior, Lady Mary Wortly Montagu, Sarah Fielding, and Jane Collier. However, the form fell out of favor with the rise of Romanticism's emphasis on originality.[30] The theorists of translation had different relationships with the genre: Dryden famously dismisses the form as not worthy of the translation label in his third definition, but Pope and Johnson engaged in both practices.[31] While imitation is the expression of admiration, travesty was imitation as satire or burlesque. On stage, it was a term used to describe theatrical roles where the character's gender and the actor's gender were different.[32] As the dual meaning of travesty shows, the relationship between texts both on and off stage was inseparable from the bodies that produced them: Helen Deutsch argues that imitation is crucial to Pope's self-fashioning as a means of

---

[29] Aphra Behn, "Essay on Translated Prose, preface to *A Discovery of New Worlds*: From the French, Made English by Mrs. A Behn, by M. de Fontenelle" in *Seneca Unmasqued and Other Prose Translations: The Works of Aphra Behn*, ed. Janet Todd (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1993), 4:77.

[30] See Timothy Dykstal, "Provoking the Ancients: Classical Learning and Imitation in Fielding and Collier," *College Literature* 31, no. 3 (2004): 102-22. For more on the relationship between originality and imitation, see Melissa Bailes, "Literary Plagiarism and Scientific Originality in the 'Trans-Atlantic Wilderniss' of Goldsmith, Aikin, and Barbauld," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 49, no. 2 (2016): 265-79.

[31] Pope's translated Homer to wide acclaim and criticized the Walpole government in his *Imitations of Horace* (1733-38); Johnson translated into English the French translation of Jerome Lobos' *A Voyage to Abyssinia* (1735), and his poem *The Vanity of Human Wishes* (1749) is an imitation of Juvenal.

[32] See Felicity A. Nussbaum, *Rival Queens: Actresses, Performance, and the Eighteenth-Century British Theater* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 189-225.

"bind[ing] his most unnatural figure to the most correct art,"[33] and women authors were more likely than men to be accused of plagiarism, the violation risked in producing adaptive work.[34] Gender and bodily form, then, like genre, could be emulated and performed.

For Hutcheon, Sanders, and Barnette, it is central that the audience or reader is aware that they are encountering an adaptation, which assumes an adaptation includes a statement that announces it as such. As discussed earlier, however, this requirement is difficult to apply to eighteenth-century adaptations. While Hutcheon categorizes appropriation as a form of adaptation, Sanders makes a significant distinction between the two concepts: "An adaptation signals a relationship with an informing source text or original…appropriation frequently affects a more decisive journey away from the informing source into a wholly new cultural product and domain."[35] Adaptation for Sanders is then a cultural product that requires another text in order to become fully legible, while an appropriation does not. This distinction feels somewhat arbitrary, especially in periods when it is often difficult to establish if the relationship between the source text and the adaptation were widely known, and if so by what means. Was the status of texts as adaptations widely known? Does this recognition that a text derives from another differ by genre? In the theater, are there references in prologues and epilogues that were spoken in performance, or do they only appear in published editions? Do novel dedications include any reference to the material being adapted? Is there a difference based on the question of whether the original text is domestic or foreign in origin? The answers to these questions are not always clear and are in no ways consistent

---

[33] Helen E. Deutsch, *Resemblance and Disgrace: Alexander Pope and the Deformation of Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 23.

[34] See Laura J. Rosenthal, *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996). For more on plagiarism in the period, see Tilar J. Mazzeo, *Plagiarism and Literary Property in the Romantic Period* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007) and Richard Terry, *The Plagiarism Allegation in English Literature from Butler to Sterne* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010).

[35] Sanders, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, 2.

even within forms. Horace Walpole's "A New Arabian Night's Entertainment" (1785), for example, signals itself as a continuation of Galland in its title. Yet there is no mention of the "Sleeper Awakened" tale from the *Arabian Nights* in Frances Sheridan's *Nourjahad* (1769), leading many critics to term it an Orientalist narrative rather than an adaptation, even though both texts share the same plot device in addition to their shared settings. Not only is the record of reception often spotty or nonexistent, it also does not appear to have been a crucial distinction for critics, artists, or audiences. For example, I open Chapter 1 with an anecdote from Samuel Pepys' diary, where a performance of Dryden's *An Evening's Love* is criticized for taking its plot from an interpolated tale in Madeleine de Scudéry's *Ibrahim*. But the prologue to the production mentions a literary source explicitly. This does not prevent Pepys and his wife from discussing the play as derivative. While contemporary adaptation theory includes audience reception as a core part of the analytical framework, adaptation in eighteenth-century studies must weigh it less strongly, given the limitations of this kind of evidence for scholars across the field.

These various theoretical and generic modes create an eighteenth-century theory of adaptation as process, but the non-literary valences of the term itself illuminate the values attached to adaptations. The earliest quotation in the Oxford English Dictionary where the word "adaptation" specifically refers to a literary work based on another literary text is in 1799 article in the *Edinburgh Magazine*. The critic confidently asserts that "it is very well known that such adaptations are the easiest efforts of genius; and may often be made successfully by those who have none."[36] The writer establishes the ubiquity of adaptations even as the term is created, and denigrates them in its presumption that artistic genius is original. But adaptation's non-literary definition speaks to the attitude that the eighteenth century had regarding what we would now term adaptations.

[36] "adaptation, n.". OED Online. March 2019. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/2115?redirectedFrom=adaptation (accessed May 02, 2019).

Samuel Johnson's *Dictionary* (1755) defines adaptation as "the act of fitting one thing to another; the fitness of one thing to another," and his examples are drawn not from literature but from pre-Darwinian science, quoting Robert Boyle on physics[37] and Thomas Browne[38] on animals. Unlike in artistic adaptations, where change is central to the mode of analysis, eighteenth-century adaptation by definition does not need alteration,[39] and "adapted to" was often used synonymously with "designed for."[40] Only with Darwin does adaptation become associated with changing in response to circumstances.[41] David Fairer argues that it was eighteenth-century poets that first redefined adaptation as a force for change, only later adopted by naturalists.[42]

Eighteenth-century theater adaptations unite these two definitions, with the text and staging needing to change from the source in order to fit the radically different circumstances of the restored theater from its Jacobean predecessor. As the large body of work on eighteenth-century adaptations of Shakespeare has shown,[43] theater practitioners of the period looked at play texts as a

---

[37] "Their adhesion may be in part ascribed, either to some elastical motion in the pressed glass, or to the exquisite *adaptation* of the almost numberless, though very small, asperities of the one, and the numerous little cavities of the other; whereby the surfaces do lock in with one another, or are, as it were, clasped together." *Boyle* (79).

[38] "Some species there be of middle natures, that is, of bird and beast, as batts [sic]; yet are their parts so set together, that we cannot define the beginning or end of either, there being a commixtion of both, rather than *adaptation* or cement of the one unto the other." *Brown's Vulgar Errours, b. iii. c. ii.* (79).

[39] David Fairer, "'All manag'd for the best': Ecology and the Dynamics of Adaptation," in *Citizens of the World: Adapting in the Eighteenth Century*, eds. Kevin L. Cope and Samara Anne Cahill (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2015), xxvii.

[40] Fairer, "Ecology and the Dynamics of Adaptation," xxix

.

[41] Fairer, "Ecology and the Dynamics of Adaptation," xxx.

[42] Fairer, "Ecology and the Dynamics of Adaptation," xxx-xlii.

[43] Important studies of eighteenth-century Shakespeare adaptations include Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and the English Romantic Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986) and *Shakespearean Constitutions: Politics, Theatre, Criticism, 1730-1830* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989); Michael Dobson, *The Making of a National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Jean Marsden's *The Re-Examined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1995); Fiona Ritchie and Peter Sabor, eds., *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012); and Fiona Ritchie, *Women and Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2014).

piece of the larger dramatic puzzle, and so felt no compunction in altering the text to fit if necessary. The radical adaptations of Shakespeare, as Jean Marsden has shown, were attempting to make Shakespeare fit into a new cultural context before the sanctity of the text was established.[44] As I detail below, the theater came under greater legal scrutiny with the Restoration, and playwrights and performers responded by adapting and rewriting the text to reduce ambiguity, not from a misunderstanding of the form or audiences but because "theater became a subject of particular concern because its emotional power could impact large groups of people."[45]

Two recent collections of essays have begun historicizing adaptation in the period. Fairer's essay is part of a larger collection of essays, *Citizens of the World: Adapting in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Kevin L. Cope and Samara Anne Cahill, which looks at the overlap and tension between fit and change in different iterations of adapting and adaptation. Taking inspiration from debates around climate change, the contributors adopt a broad approach to the ways eighteenth-century culture adapted to a changing world, but does not focus on texts which we would term adaptations. Closer to that definition is *The Afterlives of Eighteenth-Century Fiction*.[46] Cook and Seager fruitfully use Terence Case's term "afterlives" to focus analytical attention forward, towards the possibilities offered by adaptation rather than concentrating on fidelity to the source.[47] While essays by David Brewer and Michael Burden consider novels adapted for the stage, the collection's focus on fiction places the stakes of the claims firmly in debates in prose fiction such as the nature of fictionality.

This project continues these conversations on eighteenth-century adaptations and expands them to center on the nexus of adaptation and postcolonial theory. Many of the plays included in

---

[44] Marsden, *The Re-Examined Text*, 46.

[45] Marsden, *The Re-Examined Text*, 15.

[46] Daniel Cook and Nicholas Seager, eds., *The Afterlives of Eighteenth-Century Fiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

[47] Daniel Cook and Nicholas Seager, introduction to *The Afterlives of Eighteenth-Century Fiction*, 2.

this project have rarely been discussed as adaptations *per se*, and their Oriental settings point to the importance that this framework provides. Hutcheon's indigenization is implicit in the eighteenth-century approach to adaptation, where translated texts are often described as "made English" or "Englished" from their source. Indigenization extends to form: as I will argue in Chapter 2, Voltaire's plays were not just translated linguistically into English, but the conventions of French tragedy were "translated" into English tragic form. More literally, O'Keeffe's *The Dead Alive* is indigenized by deracializing "The Sleeper Awakened" from the *Arabian Nights* by changing the setting to contemporary London, as he describes in his memoirs: "My next play the 'Dead Alive,' I founded on a story in the 'Arabian Nights,' and purposed laying the scene in Bagdad [sic]; but, on second thoughts, preferred London ways and manners to Turkish turbans."[48] O'Keeffe's other two adaptations of the *Nights* retain their Oriental settings, suggesting that the relationship between adapted texts and the Orient is more complicated than just an exploitation of populist Orientalism.

Edward Said's Orientalism and Eighteenth-Century Theater

The adaptation lexicon emerges from an imperialist and postcolonial discourse that begins to emerge in the eighteenth century, as first described by Edward Said. Said's influential *Orientalism* (1978) took its eponymous title from the nineteenth- and twentieth-century field of Middle Eastern studies, arguing that the West defined itself through its "positional superiority" to the imagined Orient, the "history and tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary" that described and prescribed the cultures of the Middle East and North Africa in and for Europe.[49] Said marks this ideology as a product of the nineteenth- and twentieth centuries, when the British, French, and later

[48] John O'Keeffe, *Recollections of the Life of John O'Keeffe, Written by Himself*, 2 vols. (London: Henry Colburn, 1826), 401.

[49] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 4-7.

American empires expanded into the region, beginning with Napoleon's 1798 Egyptian campaign. At the same time that he claims the historical specificity of his argument, Said tracks this same relationship between Orient and Occident all the way back to Aeschylus' *The Persians* (472 BCE), arguing that the play shows Asia as the hostile other to the victorious Europe, exemplifying the region's "history of unchallenged Western dominance" until the nineteenth century. The Battle of Salamis, the fallout of which is depicted in *The Persians*, is notable because it was a turning point in the longstanding Greco-Persian Wars as the vastly outnumbered Greeks were able to defeat the Persian navy. This Western dominance is that of a David rather than a Goliath, and Aeschylus gives equal weight to the triumph of the Greeks and the tragedy of the Persians, the defeat coming from Xerxes' hubris like other tragic heroes. My project seeks to historicize Orientalism with adaptation in part to lose the implied sense of an innate European superiority that a *longue durée* implies.

The relationship[50] between England and Eastern empires before the colonial project of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is far more complex than between a dominant Europe and a subservient Asia. Until the nineteenth century, European hegemony was far from a foregone conclusion, and England was often economically and politically subordinate to the powerful Islamic empires.[51] As English imperial aspirations grew, the Ottoman, Indian, and Chinese empires provided alternative models of empire to Spain and Portugal.[52] The European views of the Islamic world were formed by specific, contradictory interactions, suggesting that Early Modern Orientalism is a plural category, named by Srinivas Aravamudan as "Levantinization."[53] The ahistorical application of

---

[50] Said, *Orientalism*, 73.

[51] Humberto Garcia, *Islam and the English Enlightenment, 1670-1840* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012).

[52] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage, 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[53] Srinivas Aravamudan, *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688-1804* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999), 19.

Orientalism to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries creates the false impression that European global domination was inevitable. In focusing on how the European imagination created narratives of the East, Said still deprives the imperial subject of any agency or dialogue with the West, foreclosing the possibility that the Americas, Africa, and Asia might also have ideological, economic, or political influence on Europe.[54] For example, in 1794 the Ottoman Empire established an embassy in London,[55] and ambassador Yusuf Agha Effendi was an avid theater-goer, a participant in an intercultural theatrical exchange.[56]

In addition, the relationships between imperial subjects were marked by their heterogeneity. Felicity Nussbaum argues that both European women and colonized women were united under "women of empire" and that English women's complicity in domination does not fully negate the common threat of the unregulated sexuality of the female body's "torrid zones."[57] Humberto Garcia reconfigures Romantic secularization as a form of Islamic republicanism, as radical Protestants turned to a Muslim, not Christian, world that was reworking its prophetic vocabularies.[58] English proto-feminism developed through a comparison with Islamic empires, and not necessarily to the latter's detriment: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu saw the space of the harem as a place of possibility for women, separate from the dominance of men.[59] But while Montagu

---

[54] Wendy Laura Belcher, *Abyssinia's Samuel Johnson: Ethiopian Thought in the Making of an English Author* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 6-7.

[55] David Worrall, *Celebrity, Performance, Reception: British Georgian Theatre as Social Assemblage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013),157-82.

[56] Mita Choudhury, *Interculturalism and Resistance in the London Theater, 1660-1800: Identity, Performance, Empire* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2000), 20.

[57] Felicity A. Nussbaum, *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 1-20.

[58] Garcia, *Islam and the English Enlightenment*, 24.

[59] Adam R. Beach, "Aubin's *The Noble Slaves*, Montagu's Spanish Lady, and English Feminist Writing about Sexual Slavery in the Ottoman World," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 29, no. 4 (2017): 583-606; Garcia, *Islam and the English Enlightenment*, 60-92; Nussbaum, *Torrid Zones*, 135-62

embraced the specificities of the Ottoman court in order to interrogate gender relations at home, a strand of feminist thought developed that contrasted the seemingly regressive Islamicist culture (often ascribing English theological thought to Islam) and that drew commonalities between British men and women in order to argue for women's liberation at home[60], as Mary Wollstonecraft does in the *Vindication.*[61] The Montagu letters often feature moments of cross-cultural connection that show examples of pre-Wollstoncraftian feminist alliances that were not bordered by nations.

While Said includes both nonfiction writing about the Orient along with literary narratives in his articulation of Orientalism, Ros Ballaster suggests that fiction in the eighteenth century was the best way for the West to gain knowledge of the Orient, and that the shifts in power relations between England and the Orient can be read through these narratives.[62] While Oriental narratives are not free from stereotype, Aravamudan's *Enlightenment Orientalism* nonetheless describes a relationship between Western readers and Eastern settings not solely geared towards the project of dominating the East, but rather a "fictional mode for dreaming with the Orient."[63] In a period before most direct governmental control over the Middle East was established, the imaginative space of the Orient was more ambivalent about national power relations than a rigid Orientalism might support.

This project also intervenes in Saidian Orientalism by expanding the range of genres discussed. Said reaches for performance as he defines culture metaphorically as "a sort of theater

---

[60] See Samara Anne Cahill, *Intelligent Souls?: Feminist Orientalism in Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2019).

[61] Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, eds. Anne K. Mellor and Noelle Chao (New York: Pearson, 2007), 23-24.

[62] Ros Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 6.

[63] Srinivas Aravamudan, *Enlightenment Orientalism: Resisting the Rise of the Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 4-8.

where political and ideological causes engage one another,"[64] but his engagement with literary culture rarely includes actual plays, with the exception of his brief readings of Aeschylus and of Verdi's *Aïda*. This leaves out not only the form most widely seen by the metropolitan public, but also the form that features embodied impersonations. The eighteenth-century stage offers a particularly complex space of cultural interaction, where the demarcations between actor and character could be distinct but encouraged blurring between the stage and the audience. This complicates the "us and them" framework of Orientalism, and this project will explore the different ways in which the theater placed England in relation to the Orient.

Depictions of the Orient are caught up with the development of racialized categories in the period. While Said's Orientalism extends beyond the Middle East into the Far East with the rise of American imperialism, eighteenth-century theater often conflated blackness with the Oriental subject. Repertory performances of Thomas Southerne's *Oroonoko* (1696) and Shakespeare's *Othello* (1604), along with Osmin in Aaron Hill's later *Zara* (1735) blended the theatrical figure of the Black and the Oriental.[65] The discourse of abolition separated the Oriental and the Black, allowing the paradoxical expansion of empire at the end of the transatlantic slave trade.[66] For example, in the eighteenth-century version of the *Nights*, Aladdin initially believes the genie to be his uncle, suggesting ethnic commonality. As the abolition movement grew in the nineteenth century, however, depictions of the genie transformed him into fully racialized African, associating the character with enslaved labor.[67] Eighteenth-century theater practice then shows how what would

---

[64] Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), xiii.

[65] Felicity A. Nussbaum, "Between 'Oriental' and 'Blacks So Called,' 1688-1788," in *The Postcolonial Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Colonialism and Postcolonial Theory*, ed. Daniel Carey and Lynn Festa (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 137-66.

[66] Nussbaum, "Between 'Oriental' and 'Black So Called,'" 147.

[67] Nussbaum, "Between 'Oriental' and 'Black So Called,'" 147-8.

later be recognized as difference was collapsed, disrupting the racialized binary of Oriental and Black. Roxann Wheeler has identified the 1770s as the cultural moment when racialized discourse around White and Black supplanted the Christian/heathen dichotomy often invoked in Oriental drama and narratives[68], but also how the way in which English discourse was in no way consistent in these descriptions. In eighteenth-century parlance, for example, East and West Indians, Indonesians, Persians, and others were black, and in contemporary Australia and New Zealand, Commonwealth nations initially colonized in the late eighteenth century, "black" is still often used to describe Aboriginal people, not just or even primarily people from the African diaspora.

Legal Frameworks of the Theater

As I have claimed earlier, empire and adaptation for the eighteenth-century theater must be historicized even as we theorize them. This extends to the political circumstances: while I argue that adaptation was a creative mode for theater makers, no discussion of eighteenth-century theater can ignore the legal framework that gave adaptation a unique immediacy in the period. The Restoration was the first great period of adaptation on the English stage, as the loss of a generation of playwrights during the Interregnum necessitated a heavier reliance on revivals and adaptations when the patent theaters were opened upon the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.[69] After the prolific Golden Age of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, public theater ended with the commencement of the English Civil Wars, and remained closed during the Commonwealth and Protectorate. Public theatrical performance did not resume until the restoration of the monarchy under Charles II. When the theaters reopened, they existed in a very different context. Charles II issued letters of patent to

[68] Roxann Wheeler, *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).

[69] Michael Dobson, "Adaptations and Revivals," in *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 41.

Thomas Killigrew and William Davenant to found the King's Company and Duke's Company, respectively. Each company had exclusive right to perform their plays, and the King's Company inherited much of the repertoire of the old King's Men, the pre-war company where Shakespeare spent most of his career. Paradoxically, this contributed to the eventual dominance of the Duke's Company, whose stagings of adapted texts and radical revivals became the more popular productions.[70] Given what may have seemed like the dregs of the Elizabethan and Jacobean corpus, Davenant and the Duke's Company adapted these texts to capitalize on the theatrical potential in the circumstances of the Restoration theater. The indoor theater spaces spurred the creation of new stage machinery technology which heightened the spectacle of performance, and the better acoustic conditions created space for the first Golden Age of English opera.[71] The fact that revivals and adaptations persisted throughout the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth suggests that this practice was both economically and artistically viable.

But arguably the most consequential innovation in the Restoration theater was the début of the actress, as Jean Marsden and Elizabeth Howe have shown.[72] Women had performed publicly as musicians and actors in private theatricals during the Interregnum. The writing of closet drama expanded threefold, including many by women[73], and arguably the closing of the theaters created space for more women to participate as playwrights and actors. Influenced by his time in exile on the Continent, where women had been public performers for years, Charles II officially opened the theaters to women performers, followed later by the restriction of women's parts to women

---

[70] Dobson, "Adaptations and Revivals," 43.

[71] Margaret Ross Griffel, *Operas in English: A Dictionary* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2013), xiii.

[72] See Jean I. Marsden, *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage, 1660-1720* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006) and Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama, 1660-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[73] Marta Straznicky, "Reading the Stage: Margaret Cavendish and Commonwealth Closet Drama," *Criticism* 37, no. 3 (1995): 357.

exclusively. The theater became another site of the commodification of women's bodies, but these actresses were also central to the development of an aesthetic theory of English tragedy. As I will argue in Chapters 1 and 2, from the initial reopening of the theaters, tragedy focused on the pathos of women, placing the actress's performance at the center of the play even before the rise of she-tragedy. Women performers then are a crucial part of the debates on tragedy that consumed eighteenth-century literary theory and dramatic practice.[74]

The next seismic shift in the theater's legal restrictions comes with the Licensing Act of 1737. While London had two theaters operating under royal patent since the Restoration, smaller theaters like Lincoln's Inn-Fields had opened since, where John Rich popularized the English pantomime in the 1720s. The Licensing Act reaffirmed the theatrical duopoly, restricting the performance of spoken drama to the two theaters operating under royal patent, Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Enacted as a result of controversial stagings that satirized the Walpole administration, the Act also required that all plays performed at the patent theaters must first be submitted for approval to the office of the Lord Chamberlain. The Examiner of Plays was allowed to make changes to the play or to deny a license for its performance. Any other theaters, known as the illegitimate stage, were required to stage music or dance genres, developing and proliferating the pantomime and the burletta (a form of musical comedy).[75] But while the patent theaters had no generic restrictions on the repertoire, and thus could also perform popular theater genres on their own stages, the illegitimate theaters' plays were not subject to prior approval by the Examiner (though they were often subject to regulation by various town magistrates).

---

[74] See Felicity A. Nussbaum, "The Challenge of Tragedy," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, eds. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 369-89.

[75] For more on the burletta as genre, see Phyllis T. Dircks, *The Eighteenth-Century English Burletta* (Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, 1999)

These legal circumstances of drama in the period produced two distinct theater cultures that occupied different regions of the city and placed different emphasis on text, music, and the body. The patent theaters have left a more stable record of performance, with hundreds of plays surviving in manuscript in the John Larpent Collection held at the Huntington Library, which includes the official copies of plays submitted to the Examiner between 1737 and 1824. The British Library holds the plays submitted from 1824 through 1968, when the Examiner's refusal of a license to perform the musical *Hair* resulted in enough public outcry to end government censorship. Without the need for prior approval from the government, the illegitimate theaters arguably had more opportunities for satire and critique and musical experimentation often unavailable to the legitimate stage. In fact, John Larpent had to censor Drury Lane for not submitting their afterpieces for prior review, even though the same texts would not have to be submitted if played in one of the minor theaters.[76] As the population of London expanded, rendering the two patent theaters more financially and geographically inaccessible, and as generic lines separating the content of the legitimate and illegitimate stages blurred, anxieties around the "National Drama" increased.[77] The 1832 Dramatic Report did not produce any immediate change, but a decade later the Theatres Act of 1843 passed, which ended the patent theaters' monopoly on the performance of spoken drama. But the Act also brought all dramatic performance under legal control, requiring all theaters' new plays to be submitted to the Lord Chamberlain.[78]

Adaptation and Translation in Prologues on the London Stage

---

[76] Jane Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 73-74.

[77] See Katherine Newey, "The 1832 Select Committee," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, eds. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 142-54.

[78] Jim Davis, "Looking Towards 1843 and the End of Monopoly," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, eds. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 161.

In eighteenth-century theater, adaptation is represented in various metaphors if not by name, most prominently cloth and clothing production, where the actor speaking the prologue or epilogue would compare the fabric or style associated with the source with the representative of the adaptation about to be performed. Initially, these metaphors either reference new versus old fashions, or English versus French (and sometimes Italian) fashion, and they become increasingly global as English trade expands across continents. In drawing attention to the materiality of adaptation as process, these prologues and epilogues present plays as material products as well as artistic endeavors. What plays materially produce is sentiment, characterizing the performance of sentiment as the defining aesthetic of British tragedy. The shift in the description of English sentiment mirrors the shift in England's geopolitical position. What begins as prologues marking out the value of English feeling in contrast to the superior cultural power of France changes to a centralized England drawing upon materials across the globe to produce its drama, a process that was more literally happening in trade.

Prologues used the same set of metaphors for describing both transhistorical and transcultural adaptation. In the former, as even non-Shakespeare Jacobean plays were adapted for the Restoration stage, the revision of older texts is often presented as refurbishing old clothing. For example, James Shirley's *Love's Tricks* (adapted in 1667) describes the sentiment and wit of the play as dated: "In our Old Plays, the humor Love and Passion / Like Doublet, Hose, and Cloak, are out of fashion: / That which the World call'd Wit in Shakespeares Age, / Is laught at, as improper for our Stage; / Nay Fletcher stands Corrected, what hope then / For this poor Author, Shirley; whose soft Pen / Was fill'd with Air in Comick Scenes, alas, / Your Guards are now so strict he'l [sic] never pass."[79] If even Shakespeare and Fletcher are out of fashion, lowly Shirley's *Love's Tricks* must

[79] Prologue to *Love's Tricks, or The School of Complements* by James Shirley, in *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700*, ed. Pierre Danchin (Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1981), 1-6.

be revised to be workable in this new context. This prologue plays on the meanings of fashion as both indicating the current trends and as clothing in particular. In contrast to the twentieth- and twenty-first-century approach to theater performance, the words of the plays are not fundamental to the text: rather they are external trappings that can be altered to suit new purposes without changing the core of the work. For example, in *The Imperial Tragedy* (1669), a text "taken out of a Latin Play," the prologue refers to the "fashion of Translating Playes," a metaphor that is then extended to refer more exactly to tailoring a garment: "That Model, which in Italy was fram'd / He has new Moulded, for our English stage; / Hoping 'twill fit the temper of this Age."[80] The idea of fit, then, most often illustrated through the metaphor of fashion, shows a greater concern for the circumstances and taste of the Restoration stage rather than an interest in authorial intent or the attempt to recreate different historical or cultural contexts.

The comparison between the clothing trade and transcultural adaptations is especially potent when used in reference to works adapted from French sources. A typical example can be found in the prologue to John Crowne's translation of Racine's *Andromaque* (1674): "Though you new Poets have just cause to fear, / Yet to save charge, to day we bold appear / To Act a Play by a new Poet made… And being humble, better manners shews, / Then his own Fustian on you to impose… He only turns a shabby French-Mans Coat. / A habit which to ease our Purse he chose, / No one rich trimming upon Raggs bestows."[81] Of course, refurbishing an old French play is more economical than commissioning a new work (and would only become more so after the Licensing Act). The metaphor of refurbished garments, a popular comparison though by no means the only one, frames adaptation as a useful trade, rather than a mode for artistic innovation. A common trope, the

[80] Prologue to *The Imperial Tragedy*, in *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700*, ed. Pierre Danchin (Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1981), 12-14.

[81] Prologue to *Andromache* by John Crowne, in *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700*, ed. Pierre Danchin (Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1981), 1-14.

prologue performs humility in refraining from foisting a new work on the public, rather staging a foreign play cheaply redone for the English stage.

The play text itself is not the only part of the performance that is material; for eighteenth-century adapted plays, its emotional impact on the spectators is also an embodied product and performance. Crowne's *Andromaque* argues that the familiarity of the cultural text, both the Racine work and the subject matter of the Trojan War, gives the production a challenge to overcome (making a moving performance all the more impressive) and also serves as a test of the English audience's capacity for sympathy:

> True, he has pitcht on an Old musty Tale,
> Of Troy and Greece a story something stale;
> And all old things we naturally despise;
> But since it drew out Tears from French-Mens Eyes,
> The English so much for good nature fam'd,
> Of some small pity will not be asham'd.
> Do not hard hearted to poor Trojans grow,
> Destroy'd some thirty hundred years ago.[82]

The fall of Troy's familiarity as subject matter is what will truly test the "good nature" of the English; the implication is that it is easy to be moved by a new tragedy or a tragedy of recent history, but that a truly sympathetic audience will pity the well-known fate of the temporally and geographically far-removed Trojans. Beyond the subject matter itself, the fact that the play is a translation of a successful French tragedy makes its success a national concern. English national identity here is characterized by their capacity for sympathy, in contrast to the French. The tragedy must be successful in England if it manages to make the French cry. Rather than limiting creativity

[82] Prologue to *Andromache*, 15-22.

and novelty, adaptation is the true test of artistic power: the writing and acting can move an audience that cannot be surprised by the narrative.

These prologues mark the difference between the French source and the English adaptation as the production of sentiment, an emotion defined as specifically English. The prologue in the 1744 publication of Aaron Hill's translation of Voltaire's *Alzira* (1736), for example, naturalizes this aesthetic distinction: "From a French Spring, tho', first *Alzira* drew, / Her Stream runs English, now, and flows for You."[83] The protagonist's tears may be French in origin, but their actual appearance is English. As I will argue in Chapter 2, Hill magnifies the depiction of sentiment in his French adaptations. This demonstration of affect makes the piece timely and appealing to an English audience: "Rich Britain borrows, but with generous End: / Whate'er She takes, from France, She takes to mend. / Not that the French want Fire — but waste its Rage: / Rant in the Field — to sleep upon the Stage."[84] The idea that French tragedy was lacking in true feeling is typical of English commentators, where France's devotion to the neoclassical conventions of *vraisemblence* (the adherence to truth, as defined by moral sense rather than by realism; meaning vice punished and virtue rewarded), *convenance* (authenticity and historical accuracy), and, most importantly, *bienséance* (propriety, with no reference to carnal or corporeal behavior), felt artificial to a nation where tragedy was defined by female pathos and distress. Paradoxically, French drama cannot express sufficient emotion because the French are too emotional in life (playing upon the stereotype common to much of the Catholic South). The fact then that English tragedy is not mimetic is what makes it successful; since the English are "good natured" and not as emotionally volatile in life, they have (arguably) not exhausted their capacity for sympathy for the stage.

---

[83] Prologue to *Alzira: or Spanish Insult Repented; A Tragedy Acted at the Theatre-Royal, Drury Lane* (London: 1744), 121.

[84] Prologue to *Alzira*, 121.

The prologue describes *Alzira* as an attempt to reclaim tragedy on the English stage, using the metaphor of fabric production to highlight England's aesthetic and political successes in comparison to what is seen as France's shortcomings on both fronts:

> French Wit is like French Politics — fine drawn:
> But thin, and flimsey — A mere Cobweb-Lawn. [a luxury fabric]
> England weaves slow, but strong: — with doubtful Head —
> Hangs, o'er the Shuttle — but strikes Home the Thread.
> Rouse her lost Muse — re-wake her slumb'ring Scene:
> Teach Shew, to animate — and Sound, to mean.[85]

The contrast between French and English writing is compared tin terms that echo French lace and English weaving, which in turn articulate the difference between their political systems. The French production is that of a luxury fabric, evoking the court culture of Versailles, but unreliable in its artifice. The politics of France work through the politesse of the court, as an absolute monarch is humored. British parliamentary politics, and its fabric, requires hardier stuff to withstand the debate that ultimately finds truth. The reclamation of tragedy on the English stage then comes not through Britain's artistic or literary history but rather through its production. Predicting Napoleon's description of the English as a nation of shopkeepers, drama is aligned with the Protestant work ethic of the merchant class, contrasted with the decadence of the French aristocracy.

Forty years later, George Ayscough's prologue to adaptation of Voltaire's *Semiramis* (1776) describes his tragedy as representative of England's position in a global trade network. Other than the dates of composition and translation, there is no difference between *Alzira* and *Semiramis*: both are tragedies with foreign settings (Peru and Assyria, respectively) that are translated from Voltaire. Yet the prologue's framework has changed focus from the binary cultural differences between the

[85] Prologue to *Alzira*, 121.

source's author and the English towards a more global framework that encompasses both the language origin as well as the play's setting. The play is another trade import along with the materials from the Americans and the Orient brought for European manufacturing. "From foreign shores are rich materials brought / Which to your English mode our Bard has wrought."[86] Representations of the Orient on the English stage resulted from the global network that expanded contact with the world and also increased English economic and political power.

To take another example in the prologue to Richard Griffith's *Variety, a Comedy* (1782), the rivalry between the two patent theaters is compared to a competition between merchants, providing an appealing variety of products that include both original works and existing plays newly adapted:

> Amid the rivals of contending trade,
> That court variety's successive aid;
> Two neighbouring houses most exert their cares,
> To deck with novelty their patent wares;
> Both in their turns your generous custom gain,
> For both a powerful company maintain,
> In Covent-garden, and at Drury-lane.[87]

This prologue begins by highlighting the similarity between theater and markets and the terminology and locations they share. Covent Garden and Drury Lane were centers for wide-ranging commercial activity, including theater tickets, goods and produce markets, and the sex trade. Sellers want unique or patented goods, and the London theaters operate under Royal patent, both competing for the

---

[86] George Ayscough, Prologue to *Semiramis, a Tragedy: As it acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane* (1776), http://find.galegroup.com/ecco.

[87] Richard Tickell, prologue to *Variety, a Comedy, in Five Acts: as it is performed at the Theatre-Royal in Drury Lane* by Richard Griffiths (London: Printed for T. Becket, Adelphi, Strand, Bookseller to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and Their Royal Highnesses the Princes, 1782), 1-7.

financial support of customers. On a more global scale, Drury Lane and Covent Garden are both companies like the East Indian Company, albeit a company of actors rather than a joint-stock company. As my own comparison introduces, the prologue takes up this metaphor to reflect the growing trade empire of Britain:

> What emulation fires this rival pair—
> Variety their everlasting care!
> What choice assortments each presents to view!
> Now furbish'd remnants, now whole pieces—new;
> And now old patterns, by the scissors skill,
> Slice into safety—like a cut bank bill.
> Here all the sattin of Circassia shines,
> Or home-spun stuff, with Scottish plaid combines,
> There checquer'd Harlequin's, fair Virtue calls,
> To negro nymphs in linsey wolsey shawls:
> Chictaws and Tictaws, all the town entice,
> True Eastern splendour— "Nothing but full price".
> Till good old Lun[88] rebukes the haughty boast,
> Stalks from his tomb, and sings a half price ghost.[89]

Like the Jacobean plays in the Restoration, many of these competing plays are "old patterns" redesigned. The "home-spun stuff" has united with Scottish plaid, no longer an English culture defined against the French but as a Britain at the center of a trade empire. And so, the metaphor of trade expands not just to revising older pieces or de-Frenching tragedy; the globalization of English

[88] Refers to Lincoln Inn's Fields' actor and manager John Rich.
[89] Tickell, prologue to *Variety*, 1-21.

trade means that these "remnants" are now furnished with fabric from around the world: satin from Turkey, the Italian Harlequin's diamond pattern, devolving into the shawls on black women's fetishized bodies, parodic North American tribes, and the less-than-authentic riches of the East.

As the description continues, the more problematic aspects of economic competition are revealed, not just in the questionable approach towards non-European products, but also in the slippage between the authentic and the inauthentic as competitors try to gain the upper hand. The shift from the descriptions of fabric to the description of fabric on dark bodies evokes the practice of displaying people from Africa and North America as curiosities, South Africa's "Hottentot Venus" Sarah Baartman being the most famous example. The specific performance economy includes not just competition between the two patent theaters, of course, but also the various illegitimate theaters, street performers, and fairs. As contact with the unfamiliar expands, so too does the potential for deception, as the mocking misnaming of the Choctaw suggests and the "True Eastern Splendour" being hawked on the street. While according to capitalism rivalry should provide better products for both the theaters and the marketplace, it also suggests the inauthenticity that comes as the demand for the novel and exotic outstrips production. If English theater is defined by its powerful and true sentiment, what is gained in variety can threaten what makes the English play great in the first place.

The versatility of clothing and manufacturing metaphors in prologues calls attention to the fact that plays exist not just in the imagination or in the text but in the material world: the pages of the plays sent for review by the Lord Chamberlain, the set designs and evolving machinery technology, playhouses constructed with or without Royal permission. These prologues show how companies chose to contextualize their performances for audiences, and for adapted texts they often choose to highlight the process of constructing the play, and what themes or emotions they choose to emphasize. With a source text that fills in some of the choices of exclusion that characterize all

art, adaptation allows us to see more clearly the stakes the play manifests in genre and nation. Rather than minimizing those stakes in the interest of the later realist drama's suspension of disbelief, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries highlight the tensions between aesthetics, politics, and emotion, bringing in the audience as active participants in the construction of drama.

Chapter Summaries

The first chapter shows how the practice of adaptation in Restoration theaters was instrumental in creating a new definition of tragedy after the Civil Wars. While plays like William Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (1656, rev. 1663), Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrey's *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent* (performed 1665, published 1668), and Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim* (1677) have been interpreted as exemplars of the heroic drama or Oriental tragedy, they have not been read together as adaptations of the same text, Madeleine de Scudéry's popular romance Ibrahim (trans.1652). By reading them together, I argue that these plays "translate" romance to tragedy by increasing the display of female pathos, giving the passions external signifiers that become legible on the stage; in doing so they make female emotion a defining characteristic of Restoration tragedy. Building on the work of scholars like Jean Marsden and Alex Hernandez,[90] I show how the drama of sensibility preceded the novel of sensibility. I contend that adaptation crystallizes the necessity of female pathos to all Restoration tragedy, centering the actress in the important contemporary generic debates that emerged in the artistic and political chaos of rebellion and restoration.

Considering the next generation of Oriental tragedies in the mid-eighteenth century, the second chapter demonstrates how English translations of Voltaire increase the display of sentiment

[90] See Marsden, *Fatal Desire*; Alex Eric Hernandez, "Tragedy and the Economics of Providence in Richardson's *Clarissa*," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 22, no. 4 (2010): 599-630; and Hernandez, *The Making of British Bourgeois Tragedy: Modernity and the Art of Ordinary Suffering* (forthcoming from Oxford University Press).

in language and staging when they appeared in the London theater, and in doing so created a national form of sensibility. Voltaire and Shakespeare in particular were positioned as competing representatives of their respective national traditions of tragedy. Focusing on Aaron Hill's *Zara* (1735) and James Miller's *Mahomet the Imposter* (1744) I chart how the many English adaptations of Voltaire increase the representation of sentiment in order to heighten the potential for sympathetic exchange, with both character and actor. Audiences could simultaneously identify with the imagined suffering represented onstage as well as feel the actors' own affective labor in that representation. These adaptations, I argue, show how British interest in empire was not only centered on the accumulation of wealth and political power that global trade and conquest promised but also included the exciting potential for greater emotional connection with people across the world.

Chapter Three shifts to examining eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century adaptations of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* (1706-1721), the English translation of Antoine Galland's groundbreaking translation of *Alf layla wa layla* into a European language. This chapter tracks eighteenth-century adaptations of the frame tale of the Nights, where the figure of Scheherazade becomes a trope in representations of marital violence against women. For example, Delarivier Manley's Oriental tragedy *Almyna* (1706) follows the structure of Restoration tragedy but infuses it with the then-new story of Scheherazade to articulate a vision of heroism for women that combines pathos and Roman virtù. Similarly, Eliza Haywood's novel *The Padlock* (1728) synthesizes the tropes of Oriental tales with the plot of Cervantes' *The Jealous Husband* (1613) in order to articulate a powerful and realizable form of female sexuality. I argue that these adaptations, instead of opposing a despotic East with a free England, make the violence of domestic patriarchy palpable and real.

In the fourth chapter, I link the beginning disintegration of the patent theater monopoly in the Romantic period to the way in which adaptations of the *Nights* in popular theater genres like pantomime, farce, and burletta undermined the markers of difference between their Eastern-set tales

and the urban experience of their London audiences. While Orientalist tropes such as the despotic sultan and the seraglio became stock characters and scenarios onstage, they could also gesture to a larger cosmopolitan cultural world, as in the Irish Catholic John O'Keeffe's 1789 afterpiece *The Little Hunch-back*. His Baghdad represents an Oriental metropolis where ethnic and religious difference coexist with only comedic friction. The pleasure of Orientalist popular theater productions, then, came as much from the humor of urban life shared by the Oriental and Occidental city as it did from exotic appeal.

Eighteenth-century theater has often been dismissed as limited as a result of the legal restrictions placed on theater (in contrast to the relatively freedom of print). The turn to adaptation in the face of these laws however interacted with imperial and scientific discourses that were comparatively open and only consolidated later. Nineteenth-century science became more precise and codified, taking the possibilities offered by Humean sympathy out of the discourse. These possibilities of sympathetic connection across borders were also foreclosed as Britain's imperial century commenced, when the relationship between colony and metropole coalesced around difference. At the same time as the theater monopoly ended in 1843, the British Empire's own monopoly consolidated and expanded its unprecedented global dominance. I bring together performance texts and histories together with affect theory and the history of empire to illuminate the contradictory and complex approaches to a world that saw more contact between different bodies, both onstage and off.

Chapter One

"Female Suff-rers": Adapting Emotion on the Restoration Stage

On June 20, 1668, Samuel Pepys wrote in his diary regarding seeing a new play by John Dryden: "I saw this new play [*An Evening's Love, or The Mock Astrologer*] my wife saw yesterday, and do not like it, it being very smutty, and nothing so good as 'The Maiden Queen,' or 'The Indian Emperour,' of his making, that I was troubled at it; and my wife tells me wholly (which he confesses a little in the epilogue) taken out of the 'Illustre Bassa.'"[1] Elizabeth Pepys is referring to Madeleine de Scudéry's romance *Ibrahim, or, The Illustrious Bassa*, which Pepys had earlier had bound for her at the bookseller. Originally published in France in 1641 with Henry Cogan's English translation appearing in 1652, Scudéry's romances achieved such lasting popularity in England that her work is satirized a century later in Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote* (1752) and given extended consideration in Clara Reeves' *The Progress of Romance* (1785). Dryden's debt to *Ibrahim* for *An Evening's Love* is easily spotted by the Pepyses, who describe it as to the detriment of Dryden.

Pepys' diary highlights the contradictory responses to adaptation in Restoration theater. On the one hand, the Restoration was the first great period of adaptation on the English stage. While the Golden Age of Elizabethan and Jacobean drama often turned to previous historical, literary, and mythological sources, the loss of a generation of playwrights during the Commonwealth necessitated a heavier reliance on revivals and adaptations when the patent theaters were opened at the restoration of the monarchy in 1660.[2] The fact that revivals and adaptations persisted throughout the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth suggests that this practice was both economically and artistically viable, but Pepys was not an anomaly in charging an adapted play with plagiarism, despite

[1] Samuel Pepys, 20 June 1668, in *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Henry B. Wheatley (London: George Bell and Sons, 1905).

[2] Michael Dobson, "Adaptations and Revivals," in *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, ed. Deborah Payne Fisk (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 41.

the play's own acknowledgement of its source. On the other hand, the diary also highlights the perverse pleasure that can be found around works perceived to be bad adaptations: "After dinner she to read [sic] in the 'Illustre Bassa' the plot of yesterday's play, which is most exactly the same."[3] The familiarity of the plot prompts a return to the source text, with Elizabeth reading aloud the parts of the novel that she identified in Dryden's production. The adaptation prompts a dramatic reading that speaks to the palimpsestic pleasures of adaptation[4] found in analyzing the relationship between adaptation and source.

Dryden was not alone in turning to Scudéry's *Ibrahim* for inspiration: the multiplicity of adaptations of Scudéry's *Ibrahim* shows the wide prevalence of adaptation on the Restoration stage. More broadly, it suggests that the multiplicity of narratives and characters in prose romance in particular may be especially productive in fostering adaptation. While some plays like Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim, the Illustrious Bassa* (1677) adapt the main narrative of Scudéry's novel for the stage, plays like Dryden's *An Evening's Love* (performed 1668, published 1671) draw on various subplots or interpolated tales, taking out any reference to the original source's larger context. In doing so, the plays fully or partially sourced in *Ibrahim* include genres beyond the Oriental tragedy. Adaptation is often associated with the comedic, particularly when executed as satire or burlesque, but the relationship between adaptation and the tragic genre has yet to be fully explored. This chapter will focus on three Oriental tragedies derived from Scudéry's romances: William Davenant's opera *The Siege of Rhodes* (Part 1 1656, Part 2 1661), Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrey's *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent* (performed 1665, published 1668), and Settle's *Ibrahim* (1677). I argue that these stage adaptations of Scudéry "translate" the genre from romance to tragedy by increasing the

[3] Pepys, 21 June 1668, in *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*.

[4] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 173.

display of the pathos of women, and in doing so make female emotion a defining characteristic of Restoration tragedy.

Davenant, Orrery, and Settle all dramatize moments of the rule of Ottoman Sultan Suleiman I (in England, "the Magnificent"; in Turkey, "the Lawgiver"), and all three use Scudéry's romance as a partial or primary source. The commonalities of subject matter among all three texts were reinforced in performance, with Thomas Betterton playing Solyman in all original performances[5], the same actor embodying the historical character over two decades. Bridget Orr unites these plays based on their shared focus on Solyman, but does not mention or treat the common literary source they all share. She has argued that the three plays in conjunction show how seventeenth-century drama did not "Orientalize" the Turks, Edward Said's term for European essentialized depictions of a vaguely exotic Orient in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but rather considered the specific ways in which the Ottoman Empire both offered a legitimate alternative mode of empire and was recognized as a military and political threat.[6] Building on Orr's treatment of these plays, I suggest like Orr that the specific historical context of England's relationship to the Ottoman Empire in this period complicates a Saidian reading of these plays, but also that the adaptive process in these plays reveals the stake in genre, more so than creating a national identity at the expense of the Turks.

Recent scholarship in particular has emphasized the Ottoman Empire's role in Europe and in the larger region as opposed to framing the Turks as the Other against which western Europe always defined itself, and the popularity of the reign of Suleiman I (1520-1566)[7], as dramatized in

---

[5] W. Van Lennep et al., *The London Stage, 1660-1800: A calendar of plays, entertainments and afterpieces, together with casts, box-receipts and contemporary comment. Compiled from the playbills, newspapers and theatrical diaries of the period* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1960-1968).

[6] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage, 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), 132.

[7] In order to distinguish between the historical figures and the variant spellings in different works, I will use the character spellings as they are present in the works and modern transliterations of names for the history. Suleiman is the historic sultan, with Solyman as his character name in Scudéry, Orrey, and Settle. Scudéry's Roxelana [sic]

Scudéry's *Ibrahim*, illustrates this complicated yet integrated relationship. The reign of Suleiman I was the Ottoman Empire's height of power and expansion, and he oversaw the codification of administrative, criminal, and constitutional laws while expanding their trade empire. The title character of the novel refers to another historical person, Suleiman's grand vizier Ibrahim, a Christian slave who rose to power through the palace, becoming Grand Vizier and marrying the Sultan's daughter, before his downfall and execution.[8] Suleiman, who ruled during the Ottoman's greatest territorial expansion in Europe during the sixteenth century, took on a new relevance during the second half of the seventeenth century as the Ottomans engaged in a series of intermittent conflicts with the Austrians from 1663 to 1699 and other expansion campaigns through the 1710s, making the Turks a real if not imminent threat.[9] As Nabil Matar points out, North Africans were England's most substantial non-European political and economic relationship, the non-European group with which the English would be most likely to have had direct contact.[10] Some of the plot devices in English narratives and stagings that seem incendiary in an Orientalism framework, such as the practice of fratricide to prevent rebellions led by the sultan's brothers and execution by bowstring, were actual practices up to the seventeenth century or later. Even though restrictions were placed on religious minorities and foreigners in both regions, Suraiya Faroqhi has argued against a view of the Europe/Ottoman relationship as a proto-Iron Curtain, emphasizing that the Early Modern Ottoman Empire shared a "common world" with its eastern and western neighbors.[11]

---

and Davenant, Orrey, and Settle's Roxolana are westernized names for Suleiman's wife Hurrem. Hurrem's youngest son Cihanger is Gianger in Scudéry and Zanger in Orrey.

[8] Esin Akalin, *Staging the Ottoman Turk: British Drama, 1656-1792* (Stuttgart: Ibidem-Verlag Press, 2016), 131-34.

[9] Orr, *Empire on the English Stage*, 62.

[10] Nabil Matar, *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1999), 6. See also Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1660-1850* (New York: Random House, 2002), 43-72.

[11] Suraiya Faroqhi, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It* (New York: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 2004), 211-19.

Emily Kugler cites the mid-eighteenth century, a century after the first productions of these plays, as the point when English depictions of the Ottomans shifted from reflecting their own imperial insecurities towards articulating Britain's imperial glory in contrast to Ottoman decay.[12] Recently, Daniel O'Quinn has turned from this cultural studies approach to Ottoman studies by refocusing attention on how formal mediation responded to and created these historical and geopolitical forces.[13] The Orientalist framework flattens a cross-cultural engagement as complicated and contradictory as England's relationship to, say, Italy or Spain.

Arguably the most crucial reason for the sustained appropriation of Ottoman history in England during the 1650s-1670s is Suleiman's wife Hurrem, whose unprecedented rise from enslaved harem woman to wife (the first legal marriage of an Ottoman sultan in two hundred years) marked the beginning of the 130-year period known as the Sultanate of Women, when women more publicly participated in politics.[14] Hurrem's life makes her a uniquely apropos subject for the first decades of women on the English stage, the beginning of the unprecedented rise of the actress in English-language theater. Her Anglicization as Roxolana or Roxana became a stock character on the English stage in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: the Oriental queen. Roxolana in particular is often read as a transitionary figure between the heroic tragedy warriors and the passive suffering of she-tragedy: mirroring Hurrem's historical role, Roxolana often has immense political agency in her plays, but her main conflicts often involve romantic entanglement, prefiguring the sexually-compromised woman's distress in she-tragedy.

---

[12] Emily M.N. Kugler, *Sway of the Ottoman Empire on English Identity in the Long Eighteenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

[13] Daniel O'Quinn, *Engaging the Ottoman Empire: Vexed Mediations, 1690-1815* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019), 18.

[14] For more on this period of Turkish history and women's political agency, see Muzzafer Özgüleş, *The Women Who Built the Ottoman World* (New York: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2017); Leslie P. Pierce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Pierce, *Empress of the East: How a European Slave Girl Became Queen of the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Basic Books, 2017); ed. Madeline C. Zilfi, *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

But when looking at Roxolana through a reading of adaptation it becomes clear that she signals a transformation in English tragedy rather than a gradual transition. When the Restoration stage Roxolana is compared to Scudéry's termagant Roxelana, she can be clearly read as a figure of pathos, consistent with the later domestic heroines of she-tragedy. The shift in the emphasis on pathos in the character of Roxolana show how female pathos defines genre differences between prose and performance and also between dramatic genres. Considering the oriental drama of Davenant, Orrey, and Settle specifically as adaptations of a prose romance shifts the way we understand dramatic genre in the seventeenth century, in particular the relationship between the heroic drama of the 1660s-70s[15] and the domestic she-tragedy from the 1680s through the early eighteenth century.[16] The influence of actresses on tragic form in the mid-eighteenth century tragedy revival, as Felicity A. Nussbaum has argued,[17] has a precedent in the development of tragedy at the Restoration. Eighteenth-century tragedy emphasized the bravura performances of later generations of actresses, whose performances revived the writing of tragedy at the midcentury; this echoed the first initial wave of new tragedy written for the Restoration stage that I contend was driven by the introduction of the actress from the beginning, fundamentally altering the formal definition of tragedy two decades before she-tragedy incorporated the domestic into tragic subject matter.

Restoration tragedy, in contrast to Early Modern and classical tragedy, is defined by the emotion performed onstage and affected by its audience, rather than on aesthetic or formal

---

[15] For more on heroic drama more broadly, see J. Douglas Canfield, "The Significance of the Restoration Rhymed Heroic Play," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 13, no. 1 (1979): 49-62.

[16] I am specifically building on Laura Brown's *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1981); Elizabeth Howe, *The First Actresses: Women and Drama, 1660-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992); Orr's *Empire on the English Stage*; and Jean I. Marsden's *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage, 1660-1720* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 2006).

[17] See Felicity A. Nussbaum, "The Unaccountable Pleasure of Eighteenth-Century Tragedy," *PMLA* 129, no. 4 (2014): 688-707.

qualities.[18] As Laura Brown contends, seventeenth-century tragedy is not centered on Aristotelian hubris but rather brings pathos to the forefront:

> Restoration affective tragedy substitutes the unfortunate and undeserved situation of its central character for the aristocratic status of the heroic protagonist. The unique and defining characteristic of this form is its dependence upon the audience's pitying response. The characters and episodes of an affective tragedy are comprehensible not in terms of an internal standard of judgment that directs our assessments and expectations, but rather in terms of the expressed pathos of the situation. In the fictional world posited by such a form, merit is either ignored or assumed, and action and meaning depend upon the affective power of the protagonist's plight.[19]

The focus on affect unites the various tragic genres of the later seventeenth century: the representation of affect is crucial to heroic, oriental, domestic, and she-tragedy. The tragic focus is not on an inner conflict or flaw brought to disaster by action, but on external factors that create space for the performance of emotion. As Blair Hoxby describes, early modern translations of Aristotle interpreted *pathos* as feeling; later philologists would read pathos as a dramatic action.[20] In Jean Marsden's formulation, she-tragedy is the specifically gendered genre of affect and spectacle:

> What then is she-tragedy? As generally described above, it is sub-genre of plays written between the late 1680s and first decades of the eighteenth century that focuses on the suffering and often tragic end of a central, female figure…More specifically, these are intensely erotic plays that revolve around the sexuality of a central female figure, usually a

[18] Robert D. Hume, *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 150-61.

[19] Brown, *English Dramatic Form*, 69

[20] Blair Hoxby, *What Was Tragedy? Theory and the Early Modern Canon* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2015), 9.

> woman tainted by sexual transgression, either voluntary or involuntary…The defining characteristic of the genre, this obsession with tainted female sexuality, constitutes a 'technology of gender' in which female sexuality is both demonized and defined as a treasure for homosocial exchange. In these plays, the woman does not control her own sexuality; rather, possession of her body is fought over and displayed by the play's male characters. In the semiotics of she-tragedy, control of a woman's sexuality is marked by control of the gaze, and the she-tragedy heroine spends much of her time on stage subjected to a gaze explicitly defined as male.[21]

She-tragedy is defined in two different categories: the characteristics of the heroine and the external response to her, both onstage and from the audience. She-tragedy makes female distress both an erotic and a sentimental spectacle: while the audience gaze may be theorized as male, and women also loved she-tragedy and their heroines.

Marsden, Brown, and Elizabeth Howe all argue that seventeenth-century tragedy shifts predominately to she-tragedies, retaining popularity until the 1710s. Howe suggests that this generic shift is primarily caused by the success of the first actresses, accelerated by the triumph of arguably the greatest performer of the period, Elizabeth Barry. The examples of tragedies that emphasize female pathos predate the late 1670s start given by critics; the role of Ianthe in *The Siege of Rhodes*, which I will discuss at length, is cited by Howe as a precursor to she-tragedy beginning with Mary Betterton's star performance in 1662 (the same year that the casting of women actors became law[22]); the part was originated, however, by Catherine Coleman in Davenant's clandestine performance of the original first part in 1656. *The Siege of Rhodes* is not an outlier: I argue that the importance of female pathos in other heroic tragedies, with their emphasis on the performance chivalric codes of

[21] Marsden, *Fatal Desire*, 65.

[22] Howe, *The First English Actresses*, 25.

honor between men,[23] has been undervalued. While women onstage were new in the history of English-language theater, there is no actual reason why these specific women actresses (Barry, Betterton, Margaret Hughes, Nell Gwyn, among others) were necessarily much less experienced than their male counterparts. The Civil Wars and Interregnum not only affected English playwrighting but English acting as well. While some actors like Michael Mohun had careers both before 1642 and after 1660, many of the famous men onstage like Thomas Betterton himself made their débuts after 1660; even Edward Kynaston, often framed as the last of the boy actors, started acting only at the Restoration. Men had more models from the members of the Jacobean old guard, but they did not have much if any more experience seeing or participating in theater than women did, and so actors of all genders had to develop new skills. Restoration theater is theoretically situated much like adaptation itself, a dramatic process and a performance product that necessitated holding contradictory ideas of precedence and novelty[24] for both theater makers and audiences. With this in mind, I move away from considering Restoration actresses as joining a historical event already in motion but center them as equal creators and innovators in dramatic practice and generic theory.

Romance and the Passions

Romance has many affinities with Restoration theater: in addition to the plethora of plot that make them appealing for adapters, seventeenth-century French romance like Madame de la Fayette's *The Princess of Cleves* emphasized their characters' emotional lives, making them ripe for translation into stage pathos. Scudéry's narrative is driven by descriptions of affect, and her characters,

[23] Brown, *English Dramatic Form*, 3-4.

[24] Jane Barnette, *Adapturgy: The Dramaturg's Art and Theatrical Adaptation* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2018), 18.

Ottoman or European, are marked by the mutability and violence of their emotions.[25] While many of Suleiman's important biographical moments are covered by Scudéry (including the major territorial expansion, the marriage and elevation of Hurrem, and the execution of his eldest son Mustafa), the life of Ibrahim is significantly altered. The preface[26] describes the work as part of the tradition of Greek romance (as exemplified by Heliodorus): "But with an incomparable address they begin their History in the middle, so to give some suspense to the Reader, even from the first opening of the book; and to confine themselves within reasonable bounds they have made the History (as I likewise have done after them) not to last above a year, the rest being delivered by narration."[27] Ibrahim is from Genoa, not Greece, given a Christian name of Justiniano, and refuses the hand of Solyman's daughter in loyalty to his betrothed Isabella, a Christian princess. Isabella is captured and brought to Solyman's court, where the ruler falls in love with her and plots to entrap her in his harem. The tragic downfall transforms into the voyages and reunited lovers that define early modern romance,[28] as Solyman realizes the error of his ways and frees Justiniano and Isabella, who set sail back to Genoa.

What makes Scudéry's work in general and *Ibrahim* in particular so generative for adaptation is that generic conventions of romance enable narrative multiplicity, in a way that the French stage, which adheres to the unity of action demanded by Aristotle, does not. The notorious length of

---

[25] Harriet Stone reads Scudéry's *Ibrahim* as an Orientalist text à la Said, where Solyman serves as the mirrored Other to Justiniano; see Harriet Stone, "Scudéry's Theater of Disguise: The Orient in *Ibrahim*, *L'Esprit Créateur* 32, no. 3 (1992): 51-61. I read the Ottoman court not as the Othered inverse used to define Europeanness but as one part of the world of romance, where emotion serves as the main narrative impetus.

[26] There is no scholarly consensus about whether Scudéry or her brother Georges wrote the preface, though her authorship of *Ibrahim* is not disputed. Given the lack of compelling evidence for its separate authorship, I will treat the preface as part of Scudéry's text.

[27] Madeleine de Scudéry, *Ibrahim, or, The illustrious bassa, an excellent new romance, the whole work in four parts. Written in French by Monsieur de Scudery and now Englished by Henry Cogan, Gent.* (London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, at the Princes Armes in St. Pauls Church-yard; William Bentley, and Thomas Heath, in Covent-Garden, 1652), preface. All subsequent citations in the text.

[28] Barbara Fuchs, *Romance* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 69.

Scudéry's romances allows for a diversity of narrative that she argues adds to the pleasure of the genre: "And if you finde something not very serious in the Histories of a certain French Marquis, which I have interlaced in my Book, remember if you please, that a Romanze ought to have the images of all natures; that this diversity makes up the beauties of it, and the delight of the Reader; and at the worst regard it as the sport of a melancholick, and suffer it without blaming" (preface). Historical settings can contribute to the book's plausibility, but romance needs to use style to heighten the emotional impact.[29] The heterogenous nature of romance adds to the pleasure in a way that contrasts to the prescribed homogeneity of the French stage.[30] Descartes sees the pleasure of art as producing an emotion that comes out of the direct excitement of the passions:

> And when we read strange adventures in a book, or see them personated on a stage, it sometimes excites Sadnesse in us, sometimes Joy, or Love, or Hatred, and generally all the Passions, according to the diversity of objects, that offer themselves to our imagination; but withall we take a delight, to feel them excited in us, and this delight is an intellectuall Joy, which may as well spring from Sadnesse, as all the rest of the Passions.[31]

It is the very experience of feeling, not necessarily the specific feelings in particular, that provides the pleasure in art. Romance's interest in exciting as many of these feelings as possible then gives it its emotional power.

Scudéry herself associates the enjoyment of romance "at the worst" to melancholy, and her novels are driven by how the passions drive people beyond their control. In the *Anatomy of*

---

[29] D.R. Woolf, "A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800," *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 3 (1997): 661.

[30] For more on the generic conventions of French tragedy, see Chapter Two.

[31] René Descartes, *The passions of the soule in three books the first, treating of the passions in generall, and occasionally of the whole nature of man. The second, of the number, and order of the passions, and the explication of the six primitive ones. The third, of particular passions. By R. des Cartes. And translated out of French into English* (London: Printed for A.C. and are to be sold by J. Martin, and J. Ridley, at the Castle in Fleetstreet near Ram-Alley, 1650), 120.

Melancholy, Robert Burton attributes imagination as possessing a power "which, as it is eminent in all, so most especially it rageth in melancholy persons, in keeping the species of objects so long, mistaking, amplifying them by continual and strong meditation, until at length it produceth in some parties real effects, causeth this and many other maladies."[32] The length of *Ibrahim* is not incidental then to its emotional resonance. The novel invites these physical effects by prolonging the imaginative experience. The passions or animal spirits are linked to the blood in seventeenth-century writing on emotions. For Burton, because melancholics dwell on images in the imagination for so long, the effects can become corporeal, not just mental. William Harvey published his findings on the circulation of blood in 1628, but did not immediately displace the humourism of Galen. Burton locates melancholy within the blood: "Melancholy, cold and dry, bitter, begotten of the more feculent part of nourishment, and purged from the spleen, is a bridle to the other two hot humours, blood and choler, preserving them in the blood, and nourishing the bones."[33] In the novel, Isabella and Ibrahim fall in and out of states of sickness, caused and exasperated by their worry for each other:

> The Princess was not long in her weakness, and Nature doing her uttermost, gave her spirits the liberty again which grief had arested [sic]: But thereupon, there was so great and suddain a revolution of all her humors, as she fell into a violent feaver, so that the Physicians knowing then the Princess disease, albeit they were ignorant of the cause of it, they began to treat her according to the precepts of their Art. Justiniano [Ibrahim] was also desired by order from the Princess to repair unto her; he obeyed, and came into her chamber, with a face wherein the grief of the mind so nearly resembled that of the body, as he seemed to be sicker than the Princess. (Scudéry 2.4.70)

[32] Roger Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (New York: New York Review of Books, 2001), 1.2.253.

[33] Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, 1.1.148.

In Scudéry's novel, Solyman recovers from his jealous passion, since "they, which have vertuous inclinations, and which are not wicked but by a violent passion, or the counsel of others, have need but of a moment to carry them to that which is good. Their Reason is no sooner cleared, but they find a mighty succor in themselves; and so soon as they have a will to fight, the victory is certainly theirs" (Scudéry 4.5.228). While Scudéry's pathologizing of the passions means that feelings can be caught at a moment's notice, Solyman can also recover from his passion through his own body, providing an image of the body's resiliency that anticipates immunology.

Roxelana's influence with Solyman comes from her "verbal dexterity" as she plots against Isabella,[34] and her ultimate defeat comes not through the machinations of others, but through the emotional force of her own body. Roxelana dies from rage, echoing the image of "emotion in the blood" in Descartes:[35] "For Roxelana having understood that he was not dead, and that Rustan had been torn in pieces by the people, this fierce and proud spirit, was so sensibly touched with spight for that she could not exercise all her whole fury, that after she had continued three hours together without speaking a word, she dyed for very rage and madness" (Scudéry 4.5.232). Roxelana's passions build to an extreme without any outlet, and her body cannot contain this increase of emotion. Emotion is something physical that takes up space in the body, and she essentially burns herself to death through the anger in her blood. This image is characteristic of prose; on the stage, the transfer of emotion becomes visual as *Ibrahim, The Siege of Rhodes*, and *Mustapha* transform Roxelana's inner rage into outward pathos. The descriptions of the corporeality of emotion in Scudéry's romance cannot directly translate to the visual and auditory medium of theater, where in order to be legible onstage without the aid of narrative description, Scudéry's pathologizing of the passions by linking emotions and the health and function of the body had to be translated into

[34] Ros Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007), 131.

[35] Descartes, *Passions of the Soule*, 171.

external signifiers. The adaptation of Scudéry into Oriental tragedy shifts towards the display of sentiment, in particular through the bodies of women like Roxolana, who moves from a villain with inner rage in the blood into performing distress as a figure of pathos.

Elkanah Settle's Empire of Women

Elkanah Settle adapts the main narrative of Scudéry's novel into a tragedy of the same name, *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa* (1677), which follows the plot of the romance closely until the ending; the generic expectations of resolution change from romance's reunification and the turn to tragedy's pathos. Ibrahim, a Christian slave from Genoa, has won glory for Solyman on the battlefield against the Persians. Solyman offers him his own daughter Asteria in marriage, but Ibrahim is already promised to the Christian princess Isabella, who is brought to court as a captive. Solyman elevates her to his adopted daughter so that she and Ibrahim can marry, but privately he develops a lustful passion for Isabella. What is a productive and honorable cross-religious alliance is threatened by the uncontrollable passions of the Eastern monarch, which threatens to emerge from beneath his surface goodwill. Solyman's lust for Isabella jeopardizes the friendship between the Muslim sultan and his Christian vizier. This tenuous relationship is established through the exchange of women, laying the groundwork for the presence of those same women to disrupt that relationship. Initially looking to solidify his emotional bond with Ibrahim within kinship ties, Solyman attempts to marry Ibrahim to his daughter. Ibrahim's prior attachment causes Solyman to change course, altering the circumstances so that Ibrahim can marry:

> What ever envy'd Monarch does lay claim
> To this fair Race; His glory I'le partake;
> This Lady my Adopted Daughter make.
> With all the Rites and Pomp due to my blood,

With all the Regal Ornaments endow'd,

That ever did or can attend my Race,

You shall in Her a Sultaness embrace.[36]

Isabella becomes bound to Solyman not just through his patronage but as part of his blood line. She is acknowledged as adopted, but her body is reimagined as part of the Turkish "race," transforming her into a sultaness in Ibrahim's arms. Solyman's familial and racial transformation of Isabella paradoxically leads into his desire for her person, which reconfigures Solyman's lust as incestuous. Isabella's adoption heightens the stakes for Solyman's betrayal: he breaks both the bonds of friendship with Ibrahim and the bonds of kin with Isabella.

Isabella's adoption rewrites the extent of Solyman's betrayal; similarly, physical vulnerability is placed onto the aggressor rather than the potential victim. As he frustrates his own desire for Isabella, Solyman makes himself over from the actor into the object: "And is she given into a Rivals hand? / Seiz'd and possess'd, and all by my command? / He from my bleeding heart tears that fair prey; / And in that Rape forces my life away" (II.18). After incorporating Isabella as a part of his own flesh, as it were, she then is forcibly removed. As Isabella moves between Solyman and Ibrahim, Solyman's description of the event as a rape (used in its archaic but still gendered meaning of "abduction") recalls how the power relations of empire are played out on the bodies of women. This seizure of course makes it more difficult for Solyman to violate Isabella, but the corporeal absorption of Isabella into Solyman as part of his blood displaces this violation onto him.

Female pain is coopted for male rivalry. Personal romantic rivalry is representative of the political and economic competition between Christian and Muslim empires, which becomes metaphorized through the bodies of women: "There's a storm rise in Roxolana's Sphear. / There is

[36] Elkanah Settle, *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa. A Tragedy. Acted at the Duke's Theatre. Written by Elkanah Settle, Servant to His Majesty* (London: Printed for T.M. for W. Cademan, at the Popes-Head in the Lower Walk of the New Exchange in the Strand, 1677), II.17. All subsequent citations in the text.

a Christian Beauty hither come, / That has out-done the Arms of Christendom. / The Turkish Crescents were Triumphant there; / But their great Leader is a Captive here." (II.23) Women's vulnerability with men is re-inscribed as men's vulnerability to other men, particularly men across religious and national lines. The opposition of Roxolana and Isabella here is not about the relationship with each other, nor of their relationship with men, but their sexual competition as described by men stands in for the competition between Rhodes and the Ottomans. While in this moment, the Ottomans are militarily triumphant, Isabella's beauty overpowers Roxolana's in Solyman's affections. Solyman's adoption is proved untenable: the Christian princess cannot become a Roxolana. In an adaptation of a narrative that necessitates a Muslim military victory, mapping the empires onto the bodies of women changes the conflict into a winnable one, no matter what the historical record or even the romance suggests. As in she-tragedy, the sexuality of women is subject to the male gaze, mobilized here for the narrative of empire.

Roxolana and Isabella are placed involuntarily into a place of competition by men: as competition for their bodies is an allegory for the political and economic competition of empire, the comparative value of their emotions is associated with the religious conflict. The process of chivalric love is collapsed with religious devotion:

> There was a Time! (but oh
> That Roxolana lives to speak that word!)
> When my still Lov'd, and my once loving Lord
> Vow'd an Eternity of Faith to Me;
> And call'd on Heav'n to witness that Decree;
> But now unkindly does that Heav'n invoke,
> To see his Vows and Sacred Promise broke. (III.37)

There is no eternal devotion in these Muslim invocations of faith: the Heavens are invoked for both the pledge and revocation of fidelity. This contrasts starkly with Ibrahim's loyalty to Isabella in the first act, despite the incentives to marry into Solyman's family and Isabella's initial geographic distance. Solyman's fickle love indicates the superficiality of his religious devotion. Roxolana's unique position as legal wife, both historically and in the various Ottoman narratives, means that Solyman, in breaking his decree, breaks faith with Roxolana and with his religion and also unprecedentedly breaks a legal bond. But the text also suggests that the violence of Solyman's emotions elevates his love for both Roxolana and later Isabella into idolatry.[37] In rendering romantic love in religious terms, Solyman's capriciousness becomes inextricable from his religion, which universalizes the potential for betrayal to Muslims more broadly.

But while it can be read that despite the economic power of the Ottoman Empire, neither personal nor official agreements will be respected, since Christian fidelity is contrasted with Muslim inconstancy in Ibrahim and Solyman, Roxolana offers a portrait of Muslim virtue in her death that resists this essentialist readings. Despite the fact that Settle most closely adapts Scudéry's *Ibrahim* for his play, the ending drastically departs from the source text: Solyman's daughter Asteria is mortally injured trying to free Ibrahim from the executioner, and Roxolana, distraught over losing Solyman's love, takes poison. Solyman's love is restored by Roxolana's sacrifice, and he frees Ibrahim and Isabella in remorse, and left to rule in his grief. Scudéry's Roxelana, the villain of romance, dies from her own spite at the success of the protagonists, but unlike this and other depictions of the character, Settle's Roxolana does not transform her feelings of loss into jealous rage against Isabella. In Settle, her suicide aligns her not with Christian sacrifice but with Roman *virtù*, an active choice of death over defeat: "Oh I'm all fire. / The raging Poyson does my heart-strings seize, / And on a burning Throne the Tyrant plays. / Within, within I bear my Funeral flame." (V.74) Like Nero, the

[37] Matthew Birchwood, *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2007), 171.

poison fiddles Roxolana's heart-strings as she burns, the poison sitting on her funeral pyre as she dies. Settle's Roxolana unites the romantic suffering of a she-tragic heroine with the physical courage and personal fidelity of heroic drama's code of virtue.

Despite the fact that the sexual threat of the play is focused on Isabella, the performance of sentiment is not restricted to her, and in fact the tragic pathos is embodied by the two suffering Muslim women Asteria and Roxolana. In Settle's tragedy, Roxolana's pain results from a form of sexual transgression, her failure to keep her husband's interest, and the play's pathos comes from her choice of death from this despair. While the threat of sexual transgression applies most directly to Isabella, the suffering of she-tragedy manifests in Roxolana's speeches describing her anguish at losing her emotional position as spouse:

> Had Solyman lov'd like other Turkish Kings,
> And I been one of those same suffering things,
> Who as your Slaves, your scatter'd favours caught,
> I in the crowd had had no higher thought.
> But from that hour I was the Sultan's Wife,
> My Soul grew with the glories of my Life.
> My infinite Knowledge makes my pains excess:
> Rememberance is the Plague of Greatness in distress. (III.38)

Roxolana's suffering for the loss of Solyman's love becomes the pathos of the tragedy. The initial conflict is set up along the exchange of women's bodies, and so it is women's bodies which will bear the tragic outcome. In Settle's *Ibrahim*, Muslim women become martyrs: The deaths of Asteria and Roxolana are additions that transform romance into tragedy, a performance of suffering for both the men in the narrative and the theater audience.

In prose romance, Solyman's "conversion" back to virtue can be described as emotional change linked to blood flow, stage performance necessitates a way of embodying emotional change. Scudéry's Cartesian emotion in the blood is externalized in Solyman's reaction to Roxolana's onstage suffering: "Kind *Roxolana*, thou hast made me good, / Thou hast wrought a Cure in my distemper'd blood…And shall not Heav'n my wandering sence recall, / Warn'd by a Daughters, and an Empress fall?" (V.73) The Cartesian description of emotion remains constant, but what can be described in narration must be declaimed by a character on stage. Like a she-tragedy heroine, Roxolana's death restores the moral social order destabilized by sexual deviance. She dies for Solyman's sins, converting him back to her love, echoing the language of Christian martyrdom: "Yet since my Fall does Solyman reclaim; / Since dying, I my Sultans heart regain; / This dear Conversion takes off all my pain, / Wing'd with that Bliss, my Soul Triumphant flyes: / Prepare ye Gods, for Roxolana Dyes." (V.74) Solyman's conversion back to marital fidelity comes from the pathos of his wife, not the ingenue, and a character later associated with the virago serving as the main object of sympathy. Roxolana joins this Christian sacrifice with Roman *virtù*, uniting the generic conventions of she-tragedy and heroic drama.

The Siege of Ianthe in Davenant's The Siege of Rhodes

Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* is known more for its generic and technical innovations than for its dramatic text, as arguably the first English opera. Inigo Jones designed its perspective scenery, a pioneering move for the English stage. The title page of the 1656 first quarto describes the first part of *The Siege of Rhodes* as "a Representation by the Art of Prospective [sic] in Scenes, And the Story sung in *Recitative* Musick," a series of sung conversations interspersed with choral numbers and

instrumental music.[38] The play was later revised and republished with the second part in 1663.[39] In the first part, Alphonso (the Ibrahim/Justiniano character) heads the armies from nations across Christendom that stand against the Turkish attack on Rhodes, vowing to protect the city against Solyman's attack. His betrothed Ianthe (Isabella) leaves Sicily to marry or perish with him in Rhodes but is captured by Solyman's son Mustapha. Solyman, impressed with her bravery and loyalty, frees her and grants both her and Alphonso safe passage back to Sicily. While Ianthe's virtue won him his personal safety, Alphonso believes he would be dishonored if he left the battle. Solyman is shocked that Alphonso has refused his offer, but orders his army to spare him and Ianthe when they attack Rhodes. Though Ianthe urges Alphonso to leave with her, he refuses, but begins to be jealous of Ianthe's description of Solyman's virtue, fearing what happened when she was a Turkish captive. They both remain in Rhodes as the battle is waged. Alphonso must choose between honor in battle and being with Ianthe after she is wounded. He makes his choice, resolving to fight with even more valor so that he can quickly go to Ianthe. Wounded in battle, Alphonso is united with Ianthe, begging forgiveness for his jealousy.

In the second part of *The Siege of Rhodes* (published in 1663), Solyman's second siege of Rhodes has begun. As the people of Rhodes starve inside the city, Solyman refuses to end his attack unless Ianthe personally begs for his mercy. Jealous of Solyman's interest in Ianthe and worried about her son's life, Roxolana schemes for her son to supplant Mustapha in line for the throne. Ianthe appears before Solyman to beg for his mercy, but he becomes enchanted with her beauty.

---

[38] For more on *The Siege of Rhodes* as English opera, see Edward J. Dent, *Foundations of English Opera: A Study of Musical Drama in England During the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1928); Andrew Pinnock and Bruce Wood, "A Mangled Chime: The Accidental Death of the Opera Libretto in Civil War England," *Early Music* 36, no. 2 (2008): 265-84; Andrew R. Walking, *Masque and Opera in England, 1656-1688* (New York: Routledge, 2016); Eric Walter White, *A History of English Opera* (London: Faber and Faber, 1983); Eric Walter White, *The Rise of English Opera* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1972); James Anderson Winn, "Heroic Song: A Proposal for a Revised History of English Theater and Opera, 1656-1711," *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 30, no. 2 (1997): 113-37.

[39] For more on the print and production history of *The Siege of Rhodes*, see Ann-Mari Hedbäck, Introduction to *The Siege of Rhodes: A Critical Edition* (Stockholm: Uppsala, 1973), xi-xxvii.

Inflamed by jealousy, Alphonso and the Rhodesian knights attack to rescue Ianthe. The Rhodesians are routed, and Alphonso is taken prisoner. Ianthe's pleading for Alphonso and her respect for Roxolana's claims to Solyman cures Roxolana's jealousy and she reunites Ianthe and Alphonso. Solyman is moved by how Ianthe has ended the jealous fears of both Alphonso and Roxolana, and rewards her with the power to set the terms of the treaty between Rhodes and the Turks.

While the military plot and the names differ from Scudéry's *Ibrahim*, Davenant's focus on the levels of obligation between men and the anxieties around Eastern virtue and sexuality are related to the romance[40], and the love/lust conflict at the center remains the same. Alphonso fights against rather than for Solyman, but Solyman's award of safe passage and military orders to spare Alphonso in battle indebts him to Solyman. The act echoes the loyalty Justiniano/Ibrahim feels is owed for his advancement in Solyman's court. Ianthe is more directly tied to Isabella, taken prisoner at sea and brought to the Turks. Her vulnerability to Roxolana's jealousy and Solyman's lust drives the narrative conflict. But while Scudéry's Solyman does conspire to seduce Isabella, Solyman's passion for Ianthe is displaced from her person to his desire for Rhodes. Solyman's lust does not only exist as a metaphor for imperial expansion. His sexual threat to Ianthe real for both Roxolana and Alphonso, who orders a re-attack on the Turks solely motivated by these fears.

The play completely collapses distinctions between public and private conflict, as national interests are subsumed to emotional motivations. The imperial struggle is undermined by expansive feelings, as Alphonso and Roxolana's jealousies act in opposition to Solyman and Ianthe's loyalty, aligning the characters not by race or gender but by emotion[41]: the Oriental characters do not have the monopoly on uncontrollable passions. Alphonso and Roxolana's impetuosity threaten the larger

[40] See Hedbäck, *The Siege of Rhodes*, xxxi.

[41] Susan Wiseman, *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998), 156.

military and political strategy. In a metaphor particularly poignant when performed during the Interregnum, Solyman connects imperial success with domestic stability:

> My War with Rhodes will never have success,
>
> Till I at home, Roxana, make my peace.
>
> I will be Kind if you'l grow Wise;
>
> Go, chide your Whisp'rers and your Spies.
>
> Be satisfy'd with liberty to think;
>
> And, when you should not see me, learn to wink.[42]

Solyman's concern with territorial expansion during unrest at home echoes the first English attempts at colonialism during the uneasy peace of the protectorate.[43] But his patriarchal demand that Roxolana close her eyes to what may happen in her absence carries with it the political fear that accompanies both absolutism and republicanism: that the closed doors of governance prevents emotional engagement between the ruler(s) and the public.[44] Roxolana demands accountability from Solyman as husband and king, but only receives it from Ianthe.

In *The Siege of Rhodes*, the distress of the city is conflated with Ianthe's distress, anticipating the way she-tragedy connects female suffering with domestic chaos. The tension between Roxolana and Solyman is based on their competing and incompatible readings of what the successful siege of Rhodes would mean for Solyman's emotional ties. For Roxolana, the relationship between his imperial interests and his sexual interests is not metaphorical but literal. The religious and military conflict becomes equated with the sexual competition between Ianthe and Roxolana:

---

[42] William Davenant, *The Siege of Rhodes: A Critical Edition*, ed. Ann-Mari Hedbäck (Stockholm: Uppsala, 1973), Pt I V.iv.18-24. All subsequent citations in the text.

[43] Judy H. Park, "The Limits of Empire in Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes*," *Mediterranean Studies* 24, no. 1 (2016): 53-54.

[44] For more on *The Siege of Rhodes* and the Civil Wars, see Rachel Willie's *Staging the Revolution: Drama, Reinvention and History, 1647-72* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 2015), 118-32.

Solyman. Your looks express a triumph at our loss.

Roxolana. Can I forsake the Crescent for the Cross?

Soly. You wish my spreading Crescent shrunk to less.

Rox. Sultan, I would not lose by your Success.

Soly. You are a friend to the Besiegers grown?

Rox. I wish your Sword may thrive,

Yet, would not have you strive

To take Ianthe rather than the Town. (Pt I, V.iv.1-8)

The military, the religious, and the sexual all converge in this metonymic negotiation. The crescent and the cross, symbols of their religions, become the representatives of the opposing armies in a territorial rather than religious conflict. This pattern of metonymy gives Solyman's sword a double meaning, representing both his territorial and sexual conquest, his penetration of Rhodes conflated with the penetration of a Christian woman. The crescent expands with the sword's performance, the sword's secondary meaning mapping onto the crescent, and thus Islam. The threat to Roxolana is that Solyman's emotions will expand and overwhelm his interests as a ruler, his lust for women overwhelming his lust for territory. While sentiment and politics are conflated, they are not equated: throughout *The Siege of Rhodes*, emotions threaten to overwhelm the geopolitical plot, and the stakes of the play are firmly in the former.

The quest for territorial expansion becomes ultimately literally a battle for access to women's bodies. While linking military might to sexual prowess is not a process unique to this play, the slippage between military and sexual discourses obscures any division between the two:

Alphonso. The hardned Steel of Solyman is such,

As with the Edge does all the World command,

And yet that Edge is softned with the touch

Of Roxolana's gentle hand.

And as his hardness yields, when she is near,

So may Ianthes softness govern her.

Admiral. The day sufficient seems for all address,

And is at Court the season of access;

Deprive not Roxolana of her right;

Let th'Empress lye with Solyman at night.

And as that privilege to her is due,

So should Ianthe sleep at Rhodes with you. (Pt II, III.ii.100-110)

The Admiral's concern with who is in which bed highlights how Alphonso's imaginings of Solyman's marital governance mimic the description of ejaculation, language that anticipates romance's later generic iteration in amorous fiction. The women's sexuality is "fought over and displayed by the play's male characters,"[45] as the Admiral and Alphonso assign Ianthe and Roxolana's respective sexual ownership in their absence, describing their political maneuvers as figuratively and literally erotic. The central anxiety in *The Siege of Rhodes* is that the sexual conquest will displace or outpace military conquest. The Admiral's implication that Ianthe's overnight visit with Roxolana disrupts Solyman's marriage bed calls attention to the sexual excess that later becomes synonymous with the character of Roxolana.[46] The idea that Ianthe is taking the place of Solyman in Roxolana's bed means that Ianthe is safe from neither Solyman's sexual conquest, an anxiety explicitly stated in the text, nor from the implicit threat of female homosexuality. The harem, part of Roxolana's origins, is a spatial paradox of female homosociality that, unlike a convent, operates for sexual fulfillment. As Marsden argues about she-tragedy, in the play female sexuality is

[45] Marsden, *Fatal Desire*, 65.

[46] Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients*, 69.

treasured in the homosocial exchange between Alphonso and Solyman, and demonized in that neither Roxolana nor Ianthe is trusted to control their sexual responses.

Alphonso's obsession with Ianthe's chastity filters her actions through his emotional response: her sufferings from real or imagined threat are secondary to Alphonso's attempt to control his reactions. In doing so, the play stages sexual violation without crossing over into a depiction of rape. The idea that there is no space where female chastity is safe makes sexual transgression almost inevitable, particularly in the Turkish spaces designed for sexual fulfillment. The sexual threat is not just spatial, however, but temporal:

> Alph. This Christian Turk amazes me, my Dear!
>
> How long Ianthe stay'd you there?
>
> Ianthe. Two days with Mustapha.
>
> Alph. How do you say?
>
> Two daies, and two whole nights? alas!
>
> Ian. That it, my Lord, no longer was,
>
> Is such a mercy, as too long I stay,
>
> E're at the Altar thanks to Heav'n I pay.
>
> Alph. To Heav'n, Confession should prepare the way. (Pt I, III.ii. 79-84)

Alphonso calculates the possibility of Ianthe's seduction through the time spent with Solyman's son Mustapha, casting time itself as a threat to Ianthe's chastity. The longer she stays with Mustapha, the less likely that her chastity remains intact. Ianthe's associates that time with the threat to her spiritual welfare; Alphonso's parting emphasis on confession betrays the fear of cuckoldry. His insistence on marking the number and length of the nights spent with Mustapha (which Ianthe does not specify) quantifies the threat of violation, measuring the extent to which Ianthe may be devalued. Alphonso's

jealousies suggest not only that Ianthe may be assaulted or seduced in the future, but that it has already happened:

> He in two Days your high esteem has won:
>
> What he would do I know; who knows what has he done?
>
> Aside. Done? Wicked Tongue what hast thou sayd?
>
> What horrid falshood from thee fled? (Pt I, IV.ii.43-46)

Describing Solyman's military assault on Rhodes as a metaphor for assault is inadequate; the threat is not just what could happen to Ianthe and other Christian women should the Turks succeed, but also what may have already happened. The casting adds to this effect: Thomas Betterton, as previously mentioned, played Solyman opposite his wife Mary Betterton, herself an accomplished tragic actress, as Ianthe in 1661.[47] The Bettertons' presumably consummated marriage means that sex between Solyman and Ianthe is *fait accomplit* even though within the narrative, it is only a figment of Alphonso's imagination, a process Vivian Davis has termed in a forthcoming project as "the performance of kinship."

The play's prevailing suggestions that the greatest threat to Ianthe has already been accomplished outlines an alternative narrative that follows the generic conventions of she-tragedy closely. While *The Siege of Rhodes* does not include a raped or sexually transgressive woman in the narrative, the play stages a scene of violation nonetheless. As Roxolana resolves to murder Ianthe in the seraglio, the scene opens with a tableau that anticipates what Marsden describes as the *mise-en-scène* of violation:[48]

---

[47] Howe, *First Actresses*, 148-49.

[48] "Immediately after the rape, the scene draws to display the erotic spectacle of the ravished woman: 'the Scene draws, and discovers Eurione in an Arbour, gagg'd and bound to a Tree, her hair dishevel'd as newly Ravish'd, a Dagger lying by her' (25). The elaborately coded tableau carefully presents Eurione to the audience's gaze: Euorione's 'Ravish'd' hair becomes the signifier of her violation, the ropes and gag certify to her helpless state, while a dagger, the symbolic representation of her violation, lies by her side. This exhibition of erotic symbols establishes the crisis of ravished womanhood around which the play centers" (Marsden, *Fatal Desire*, 78).

> The Scene is Chang'd. Being wholly fill'd with Roxolana's Rich Pavilion, wherein is discern'd at distance, Ianthe sleeping on a Couch; Roxolana at one End of it, and Haly at the other; Guards of Eunuchs are Discover'd at the wings of the Pavilion; Roxolana having a Turkish Embroidered Handkerchief in her left hand, and a naked Ponyard in her right. (Pt II, IV.iii, stage directions)

Ianthe is passively displayed in repose for the audience's gaze, in stark contrast to her refusal of the male gaze in her initial veiled entrance.[49] The naked, phallic dagger as the weapon of choice suggests the act of rape. Roxolana's embroidered handkerchief evokes Desdemona's strawberry handkerchief, Othello's "ocular proof"[50] of her violated chastity.[51] She initially attempts to draw Ianthe near enough to kill by saying she has a kiss for Ianthe from Solyman, and as Roxolana exits, having been won over by Ianthe's sentimental performance, she gives Ianthe a kiss of friendship (Pt II, IV.iii.39, 41). The kiss, first identified as Solyman's, is ultimately consummated.

The play stages a theoretical rape, enacting the tragic ending that it ultimately avoids. Yet the focus on Alphonso's emotions over Ianthe delineates this play as a non-tragic heroic drama even before the ending is resolved. Ianthe's suffering is rehearsed but never truly performed, articulating the generic conventions of tragedy that will later define she-tragedy and in doing so makes genre (and the conventional fulfillment that it demands) the basis of tension for the drama. The battle may be lost and the Turks may take Rhodes, but unless the siege of Ianthe is successful the production remains drama, not avoids tragedy.

---

[49] Sophie Tomlinson, *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005), 159.

[50] William Shakespeare, *Othello*, ed. E.A.J. Honigmann (London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1997), III.iii.363.

[51] *Othello* in particular is important in the history of women in tragedy, as the first actress on the professional English stage debuted in Desdemona. See Howe, *First Actresses*, 19.

Orrey's Mustapha and the Gender of Pathos

While *Ibrahim* and *The Siege of Rhodes* stage the romantic conflict in Scudéry's main plot, Orrey's *Mustapha* (performed in 1665, published in 1668) focuses on an event relayed in one of the novel's interpolated tales, "The History of *Gianger* and *Mustapha*," which shows how Roxelana used her influence to arrange the murder of Solyman's firstborn son, heightening the stakes for Ibrahim's conflict with her.[52] The play opens as Solyman has defeated the Hungarian armies, abducting Queen Isabella and her young son the Infant King. Solyman requests the child in exchange for sparing the rest of the Hungarian army. Roxolana is moved by the queen to plead with Solyman to save the boy's life, who ultimately agrees. Watching the moving scene between the queens, Solyman's sons Zanger [Scudéry's Gianger] and Mustapha each fall in love with the Hungarian queen's display of tenderness, but they declare that being rivals in love will not weaken their loyalty to each other. Unlike *The Siege of Rhodes* and *Ibrahim*, where pathos is predominantly if not exclusively female, *Mustapha* is notable for its depiction of male affect. As Brown argues, Orrerian drama operates through an aristocratic code of honor,[53] and in *Mustapha* this code is performed as male sentiment. Even the Queen's offstage maternal emotion is rendered onstage as a male performance of sentiment by Zanger: "When she her Royal Infant did embrace, / Her eyes such floods of Tears showr'd on her face, / That then, oh *Mustapha*! I did admire / How so much Water spring from so much Fire: / And, to increase the miracle, I found / At the same time my heart both burnt and

[52] Mustapha's death was also previously dramatized in Fulke Greville's closet drama *Mustapha* (1609); for more on Orrey's *Mustapha* as an adaptation of Greville's, see Mita Choudhury, *Interculturalism and Resistance in the London Theater, 1660-1800: Identity, Performance, Empire* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell Univ. Press, 2000), 61-86. For more on the story of Mustapha in drama, see Sarah Jayne Hitt, "The Story of Mustapha in History and Drama, 1588-1739," *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 21, no. 2 (2006): 24-39.

[53] Brown, *English Dramatic Form*, 6.

drown'd."[54] The Queen's emotion for her child would seem to exclude Zanger and Mustapha. But here the domestic pathos is described rather than performed, and the sympathetic exchange is between men onstage. In the love triangle between the princes and Queen Isabella, male feeling is both doubled and evacuated: "Her Tears forbidding whom her Eyes invite, / Whilst she appears the joy and grief of fight; / Whilst empty hope does rise but to decline; / Then you will think your sorrows less then mine" (III.79). Unrequited love builds the desire only to have the disappointment increase, and makes other feelings lesser in comparison. But earlier, Mustapha in turn watches the Queen's performance of sentiment, and similarly falls in love:

> Must. She is as tyrannous as she is fair,
> Born to breed love, and to beget despair;
> I did lament her fortune, but I see
> One much more cruel is reserv'd for me.
> Can Zanger, for my love, my friendship blame,
> When the same fire does us alike inflame?
> My weakness cannot forfeit his esteem,
> Since I but yield to that which conquer'd him;
> To love whom be first lov'd, can be no more
> Then if I hate whom he did hate before. (II.77)

The Queen's pathos produces romantic love, but in this equation the brothers' distress outweighs hers over the loss of her son; the brothers' distress at unrequited love is compounded by this love placing them in competition. Mustapha reframes this conflict, much like how the brothers reframe

[54] Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrey, *The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent. Written by the Right Honourable the Earl of Orrey* (London: Printed for H. Herringman, at the Sign of the Blew Anchor in the Lower Walk of the New Exchange, 1669), II.74. All subsequent citations in the text.

their political conflict, and their shared love object brings their amorous feelings into sympathy with that their fraternal loyalty enjoys.

In a system of primogeniture, fraternal feeling has political consequences, and the play's tension revolves around the tenuous political structure that is enabled through the affective bonds between men. While the Roman origins story (and with it Britain's civic origins)[55] is founded on the conflict between Romulus and Remus, Zanger and Mustapha transform the power conflict between rivalry into symbiosis. Turkish custom until the early seventeenth century declared that when the new sultan ascends to power, he executes his brothers to eliminate competing claims to the throne. The brothers are united in friendship despite their competing political interests; Mustapha has sworn to Zanger that when he becomes Sultan he will end this custom, and so in turn Zanger has vowed that he will not outlive his elder brother's untimely death. Mustapha and Zanger's affective bond attempts to neutralize their competing political interests, without openly defying the conventions of the court while under Solyman's rule: "Our secret Sympathy your Fate secures: / If bad, my Breast would feel't as soon as yours. / And since you but bequeath a Legacy, / Which cannot be possest before you dye, / You safely give what I shall ne're receive / Because I cannot *Mustapha* out-live" (IV.101). In linking their political fates, Mustapha and Zanger link their bodies: as Zanger promises not to outlive Mustapha, thus negating the possibility that he would usurp his throne. Their sympathy of feeling is both sentimental and biological. In the body politic, by sharing a fate they must also share a body, their lifespans united. Even Mustapha and Zanger's seeming competing interests are neutralized by their love. If their pact had succeeded, it would have guaranteed peaceful succession without the execution of the remaining heirs, thus bringing the judicial code into line with private fraternal feeling. The sympathy between brothers naturalizes the peaceful transference

[55] For more on Roman civic virtue and English national identity, see Philip Ayres' *Classical Culture and the Idea of Rome in Eighteenth-Century England* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997).

of power[56] from the procreative father-son line to the fraternal. Emotions shared between men, particularly when those feelings cross with the erotic, leads to specific political actions and relies on reciprocity, in contrast to the passive spectacle that marks the sexuality of women in she-tragedy.

Paternal and filial sentiment is also necessary for that transference, and Solyman's lack of faith in these natural affective bonds threaten the stability of his regime. The vizier Rustan, frustrated with this most recent evidence of Roxolana's influence over the sultan at the expense of his ministers, decides to use her love for her son Zanger to turn her against the Sultan's firstborn son and heir, Mustapha. With Roxolana's encouragement, Rustan turns the sultan against his own son by implying that Mustapha is trying to usurp his power through the army's loyalty to the son over the father. Solyman's fears that Mustapha is gaining his janissaries' loyalty in order to stage a coup are contradictory to his natural love for his son: "Forgive me, *Sultan*, if I boldly sue / In Natures cause between your Son and you; / Those orders which to *Mustapha* you sent, / His filial kindness takes for Banishment" (III.82-85). The very fact that they are father and son ensures Mustapha's loyalty and a peaceful succession. Instability and revolt are threatened when Solyman breaks that affective bond. In contrast to the passivity of female suffering in she-tragedy, male emotion is active, inextricable from the actions of imperial rule. In *Mustapha*, the Ottomans are secure only if the sameness of male affect and interests are preserved.

Roxolana's attempt to transform her distress for her son's seemingly inevitable death into action becomes the she-tragic transgression that must be punished. Roxolana is set in opposition to and outside of the political hierarchy, a position which disallows the complete sympathy achieved by Mustapha and Zanger. While the men all have prescribed roles in the hierarchy, Roxolana's inability

[56] Later, the politics of fraternal love would become more immediate for an English audience. *Mustapha* was later revived by the United Company in 1686 after Charles II died and his brother James II succeeded due to Charles' lack of a legitimate heir. Therefore, the first transfer of power after the Restoration occurred between brothers. See Elaine McGirr's *Heroic Mode and Political Crisis, 1660-1745* (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 2009), 39-45.

to reconcile her different loyalties leads to the tragic murder: "These little Arts great Nature will forgive: / Dye *Mustapha*, else *Zanger* cannot live! / Pardon, oh *Solyman*, thy troubl'd Wife, / Who must her duty lose, to save a Life; / A Husband venture to preserve a Son; / Oh! that's the fatal rock that I would shun" (II.72). Coupled in the heroic verse, her competing loyalties as a wife and a mother are set up against the opposing interests of Mustapha and Zanger, Solyman and Roxolana, and between her natural love and her artful machinations. Roxolana's emotional conflict allows her to be used as a tool by duplicitous advisors.[57] While the display of emotion is not in and of itself feminizing in the play, what is feminine are these paradoxical couplings. Female affective bonds conflict with each other and with the affect of others, jeopardizing political stability. Conveniently, as *Mustapha* stages the civic crisis from which England had just emerged, the Restoration's collective regicidal guilt[58] is taken from the male body politic that destroyed the nation's stability and is blamed on an individual woman's deviance.

While excluded from male homosociality, female sentiment is not homogenous. *Mustapha* features multiple scenes that set the Queen and Roxolana in opposition, a *mise-en-scène* that calls attention to the importance of the actress on the Restoration stage. While they are no rival queens, and often share sympathies and goals, they are not collapsed into sameness like the brother princes. First, the queens are set up as diametrically opposed, both in nation and religion. Scudéry's Persian princess Axiamira, from a competing Muslim nation, becomes the Hungarian and Christian queen Isabella, mimicking the war currently being fought between the Ottomans and the Hapsburgs. Even in metaphors of accord they are positioned not as compatriots but as opposites: "Madam, 'tis only *Solyman* and you / Can boast they *Roxolana* did subdue; / And that your triumph may the more

---

[57] Alex Garganigo, "The Heroic Drama's Legend of Good Women," *Criticism* 45, no. 4 (2003): 488.

[58] Nancy Klein Macguire, *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), 178.

appear, / You in this very Camp have Conquer'd her" (II.67). Roxolana describes her feelings towards the Queen in the martial metaphors of love, and the Queen and Solyman are linked, not she and Roxolana. The casting in the original production added to this effect. Roxolana was played by star tragedienne Mary Betterton opposite Mary "Moll" Davis as the Queen, an actress known for her dancing and epilogues (and later mistress of Charles II). While both parts are tragic in nature, the contrast between the gravitas of the established star Betterton and the young Davis in one of her early roles, previously known for her dancing in breeches, is striking. Much like how the Queen's presence in court disrupts the initial sympathy between the brothers, the persona built by Davis's personal life and previous work counteracts the role's otherwise expected dramatization of virtuous suffering.

It is Roxolana's less virtuous suffering, however, that signifies tragedy in *Mustapha*. Solyman becomes convinced of Mustapha's treason, and executes him. Zanger, seeing the dead Mustapha, protests his innocence to the sultan before killing himself at Mustapha's feet. Roxolana is horrified to learn that her machinations have caused the death of her son. Solyman, distraught with the loss of both his sons at his orders, decides to execute Roxolana after she signs a confession exculpating him, to avoid an uprising. He changes his mind and banishes her instead, but grieved to rule without his love at his side. Roxolana's emotions begin as a zero-sum game, as her excess love for her son at the expense of that for her husband, but with Zanger's death her feeling becomes exponential. Her grief is doubled, expecting to grieve only for Mustapha, but then she must also lament her son:

> Rox. Ah Mustapha! I hither came to grieve
> That by thy death I made my Zanger live;
> But he too soon for my offence has paid;
> And I, thy Traytor, am by him betraid.
> Madam, your tears will now injurious be;

In grief, as honour, you out-rival me.

Queen. You Zanger lov'd, then do not me reprove

Grieving for two who had no fault but love. (V.117)

The actual math of this doubling is ambiguous: Roxolana's grief doubles, yet remains less than the Queen's. By her reckoning, Roxolana's grief for her son is compounded by her grief for her lovers. Ultimately, Roxolana is banished for this deceit. The princes' virtue demands more grief than she can give, and Roxolana's fall is all the more dramatic for being raised above all others in the seraglio: "You needed many Tears to wash away / The stains which have defil'd this bloody day. / Brave *Mustapha*, and *Zanger* too is dead; / These have deserv'd more Tears than you can shed" (V.120). For Solyman, Roxolana cannot make up the loss. For male characters, rather than linking rationality and good governance, it is strong feeling that characterizes a healthy body politic. But for Roxolana, her excess emotion is both the cause of her suffering as well as punishment for her actions. While she instigates the violence that leads to these deaths, as she does as the villain in *Ibrahim*, Roxolana's staged suffering provides the plays with its moments of tragic pathos.

The equation of male feeling with good governance and female feeling with rebellion is what makes this play a tragedy. While Brown believes that Orrey's emphasis on the aristocratic code in action makes any generic distinction between a heroic drama like *Henry the Fifth* (1662) and the tragedy *Mustapha* arbitrary,[59] I argue that it is female pathos that makes that distinction: Roxolana (unlike Zanger, Mustapha, and Solyman) does not operate within these aristocratic codes, and her actions are what cause the play's tragic conclusion. Unlike *Henry the Fifth*'s Katherine of Valois, who properly hierarchizes romantic love and political duty,[60] Roxolana's excessive emotion is out of the

[59] Brown, *English Dramatic Form*, 9.

[60] Tracey E. Tomlinson, "The Restoration English History Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrey," *SEL Studies in English Literature 1500-1900* 43, no. 3 (2003): 566.

bounds of appropriate political action. The play's emphasis on male emotion would seem to offer an example of the heroic drama outside of the she-tragedy trajectory, but as Brown shows the performance of male sentiment does not necessarily indicate tragedy. As dramatized in *Mustapha*, performed female pathos generically separates the tragic from the dramatic.

Tragedy and the Rise of the Actress

Mustapha's displacement of the collective culpability for regicide onto one individual woman points to the ways in which the actress in Oriental tragedy carries a political weight that remains to be explored. The fact that Roxolana became associated with a specific character type has perhaps confused the importance of actresses to heroic drama and its continuity with she-tragedy. Roxolanas (and Roxanas) reappear in texts throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries[61], and such characters became, as Katie Trumperner describes, "the literary character, an oriental queen who always, no matter what the plot in which she appeared, embodied ambition, sexuality, revenge, exoticism."[62] In this characterization, Roxolana seems an unlikely candidate for the expression of pathos, and magnified if reading Restoration characters mainly as manifestations of specific types. The seventeenth-century emphasis on casting types means that certain actresses and actress pairings have also obscured Roxolana's potential as a vehicle for pathos. Paired actress types (the wife/mother against the ingenue) would appear to focus the performed suffering on the ingenue, who becomes the focus of she-tragedy. The seventeenth-century performance record suggests that

---

[61] In addition to the four texts discussed here, Roxolana/Roxana appears in Richard Knolles' *The Generall Historie of the Turks* (1603), revised and expanded by Paul Rycaut as *The Turkish History* (1687); Gauthier de Costes de la Calprenède's *Cassandra* (1652); Jean Racine's *Bajazet* (1672); Nathaniel Lee's *The Rival Queens* (1677); Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes* (1721); Daniel Defoe's *The Forunate Mistress* (1724); Isaac Bickerstaffe's *The Sultan, or A Peep into the Seraglio* (1787). For a more extended discussion of the literary history of the Roxolana, see Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients*, 59-192 and ed. Galina I. Yermolenko, *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010).

[62] Katie Trumpener, "Rewriting Roxane: Orientalism and Intertextuality in Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes* and Defoe's *The Fortunate Mistress*," *Stanford French Review* 11, no. 2 (1987): 178.

the calcification of Roxolana as the virago is the result of eighteenth-century revivals and adaptations, not a part of the initial characterization of the role. Mary Betterton, whose performance of Ianthe in *The Siege of Rhodes* was so powerful for Pepys that he referred to her by the character's name in his diary, played the young heroine in both *Rhodes* (1661) and *Ibrahim* (1676) as Isabella, but in between these productions played Roxolana in *Mustapha* (1665), opposite Mary Davis in the more obviously pathetic role of the Queen of Hungary.[63] After watching a performance of *Mustapha*, Pepys refers to Betterton's performance as Roxolana by only the name of Ianthe[64], collapsing what would seem to be two polar opposite archetypes into one character. Roxolana is brought alongside Ianthe and Isabella as a tragic role for women, without an emphasis on her racialized, sexual otherness that later defines the character.

Roxolana's presence in at least one epilogue similarly points to her position as a she-tragic heroine. Epilogues are moments when the performer and the audience directly emotionally connect, conflating actor and character while dissolving the distance between actor and audience, and is exemplified in the epilogue to Settle's *Ibrahim*. Nell Gwyn famously rose from the dead onstage to deliver the epilogue of *Tyrannick Love* (1669), as "the Ghost of poor departed *Nelly*"; a joke that plays on the tension between her own celebrity and the character she embodies.[65] Epilogues were particularly associated with actresses' performances,[66] and offered a moment of connection after the

---

[63] Edmund Curll's often spurious biography of Elizabeth Barry (1740) cites the Queen of Hungary in *Mustapha* as the role of her triumphant return to the stage in 1675, after her coaching from John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. However, there is no extant record of a performance of the play that year.

[64] "With Creed, my wife, and Mercer to a play at the Duke's, of my Lord Orrery's, called 'Mustapha,' which being not good, made Betterton's part [Solyman] and Ianthe's [Roxolana] but ordinary too, so that we were not contented with it at all" (Pepys, 3 April 1665).

[65] Diana Solomon, *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theater* (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 2013), 21. See also Jane Milling, "'For Without Vanity, I'm Better Known': Restoration Actors and Metatheatre on the Restoration Stage," *Theatre Survey* 52, no. 1 (2011): 59-82.

[66] Howe, *First Actresses*, 93.

communal experience of the performance. The performers of the prologues and epilogues to *The Siege of Rhodes*, *Mustapha*, and *Ibrahim* do not survive in the record.[67] With the epilogue to *Ibrahim*, however, the surviving text and cast list allow us to make an educated guess that it was performed by Mary Lee, who played Roxolana. Lee was a popular performer of epilogues[68] and the epilogue is structured by making a comparison between the character of Roxolana and the audience. In what Diana Solomon terms a revived epilogue, the actor begins by contrasting the play with other tragedies: "How many has our Rhimer kill'd to day? / What need of *Siege* and *Conquest* in a Play, / When *Love* can do the work as well as they?" (1-3).[69] In particular, it is the death of Roxolana (not the young Asteria) which the epilogue focuses on its emotional power:

> Yet 'tis such Love as you've scarce met before:
> Such Love I'm sure as English ground ne're bore.
> Had half the injur'd Ladys of this Age,
> His Roxolana's kindness, and her Rage,
> What heaps on heaps of Female-suff'rers here,
> Would your good Men make Martyrs in one year? (4-9)

The epilogue domesticates her distress: the audience is full of her fellow "Female-suff'rers," whose emotions may vary in degree but not in kind. Roxolana's emotions (her love for Solyman, her distress at her abandonment, her fatal despair) are not unfamiliar to the Englishwomen in the audience, they just don't feel as strongly. And while the Roxolana figures in plays like *Mustapha* as a

---

[67] The texts of the prologues and epilogues to *Mustapha* do not survive; they are not included in its published version, which appeared with Orrery's *Henry V*.

[68] Phillip H. Highfill and Edward A. Langhans, *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers and Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1984), 9:200. Lee was even arrested for performing the epilogue to *Romulus and Hersilia, or, the Sabine War* (1682), which mocked the Duke of Monmouth during the Exclusion Crisis. See Solomon, *Prologues and Epilogues*, 12.

[69] Pierre Danchin, *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration, 1660-1700* (Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1981), 703-4.

scapegoat for chaos, this epilogue returns ironic attention to the cause of all this suffering, the "good Men" of England who would drive "heaps on heaps" of women to their deaths. English and Ottoman women are united through their common suffering at the hands of a common patriarchy that views their pain as collateral damage.

This moment suggests that despite the lack of gendered indicators about the performer and the third-person references to Roxolana, this epilogue was performed by an actress and most likely the one playing Roxolana. It is followed by a moment of identification between the performer and the female audience members addressed:

> But thanks to Heav'n you've not her fond Disease:
> E'ne let 'em range and wander where they please;
> You're not such Fools to think of Poysoning yet;
> You want her Love, but you have twice her Wit.
> Dying's a Mode your wiser thoughts contemn:
> You've a more pleasing way to punish 'em." (10-15)

The actress has a moment of connection with the audience, addressing herself to the female spectators directly and describing what she reads as their thoughts and emotions. Again, the passions are pathologized, which means that the disease can spread or be avoided. Coming alive after her suffering has been put on display, Roxolana and the actress playing her have a moment of connection with the female spectators, making comedy arise from the difference between the spectacle of female emotion and the lived experience of it. While many women who watched she-tragedy loved the suffering characters, this epilogue signals that the pleasure derived not solely (or even primarily) from identification, but from the distance between their own various emotional lives and the specific kind of sentiment embodied in performance.

The metatheatrical distance encouraged in the performance of epilogues echoes the distance that adaptation can produce, whether the play acknowledges the process or not. For critics, confronting texts as adaptations reveals a different relationship than previously understood between gendered emotional performance and generic development. But the plays discussed here also suggest that adaptation as a practice played a crucial role in the development and theorization of genre. Adapting *Ibrahim* for the stage required not just transforming impersonal description into dialogue and compressing the narrative action, but also rethinking the role of emotion, and specifically the suffering of women. Adaptation crystallizes the generic necessity of female pathos to all Restoration tragedy: actresses did not rise from the dramatic margins in heroic tragedy to prominence in domestic tragedy, but their presence and performances created the theory of tragedy for a new order emerging in the artistic and political chaos of rebellion and restoration.

Chapter Two

"Heav'n's Interpreter": Voltaire's Oriental Tragedies and British National Sympathies

No aspect of eighteenth-century adaptation, if not eighteenth-century theater in general, has been written about more than the proliferation of Shakespeare adaptations in the period. That this is also the same period that elevated Shakespeare's status to that of the greatest writer in English feels paradoxical to a literary culture that now views his words as sacrosanct. One of the most enduring legacies of eighteenth-century theatrical culture is the creation of the cult of Bardolatry, which elevated Shakespeare from one of many talented playwrights from the Elizabethan Golden Age of Drama to the greatest writer of the English language and a representative of British national identity, and no analysis of tragedy in the period can work without this consideration. But what has been under-appreciated has been Voltaire's role in the creation of bardolatry, both in the French writer's own works but also what he symbolized for English commentators. This framing is most obvious in Elizabeth Montagu's *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespear, Compared with the Greek and French Dramatic Poets. With Some Remarks Upon the Misrepresentations of Mons. De Voltaire* (1769), where Montagu theorizes Shakespearean tragedy as the definitive English tragic mode in opposition to classical French tragedy, embodied by the writings of Voltaire. The elevation of Shakespeare in the eighteenth century is in part a demarcation of the aesthetic value of originality at the expense of imitation; paradoxically, this great period of adaptation viewed his work as exemplary of "grace beyond the reach of art."[1] This originality is located in feeling rather than content, and so Shakespeare's plays, made fit for the stage conventions of the eighteenth century, is more innovative than Voltaire's work, which primarily stress an adherence to the formal expectations and history of French tragedy.

[1] Alexander Pope, "An Essay on Criticism," in *Poetry and Prose of Alexander Pope*, ed. William Aubry (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969), 152.

This chapter will argue that literary adaptation foregrounds the role of sentiment in the creation of national identity, especially in the English stage adaptations of Voltaire's Oriental tragedies. Of the sixteen adaptations of Voltaire that premiered in London between 1734 and 1776,[2] seven feature Eastern Mediterranean or Oriental settings. As commentators assessed the emotional resonance in the period, they often incorporate or echo contemporaneous Scottish Enlightenment writing on sympathy and the passions, including David Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* (1738), Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759), and Henry Home, Lord Kames' *Elements of Criticism* (1762). These theories often centered on tragedy as examples of the ways in which our emotions are bound up in the experience of others, whether at a remove as in the case of readers or co-present as in the case of dramatic actors on stage. What these writers and other contemporaries highlight is the physicality of both the process of sympathy and theater practice, including the materiality of emotional exchange, the spatial relationship between performers and spectators, and the corporeality of dramatic representation.

The stakes of the interplay among the spatial, material, and corporeal in dramatic (especially tragic) sympathy are heightened in depictions of the Orient, as the political and economic relationships between Britain and non-European nations were expanding. This socio-political and literary negotiation is often mediated through France, its culture, and its language, the lingua franca of Europe.[3] Eighteenth-century Britain's imaginative engagement with the Orient is inextricable

---

[2] These adaptations are William Duncombe's *Junius Brutus* (1734); Aaron Hill's *Zara* (1735), *Alzira* (1736), *Merope* (1749) and *The Roman Revenge* (1753); James Miller and John Hoadley's *Mahomet the Imposter* (1744); Arthur Murphy's *The Orphan of China* (1759), *No One's Enemy but His Own* (1764), and *Alzuma* (1772); Charles Macklin's *The Man of the World* (1766); George Colman the Elder's *The English Merchant* (1767); Thomas Francklin's *Orestes* (1769) and *Matilda* (1775); Dorothea Celesia's *Almida* (1771); Joseph Cradock's *Zobeide* (1771); and George Ayscough's *Semiramis* (1776). See Harold Lawton Bruce, "Voltaire on the English Stage," *Modern Philology* 8, no. 1 (1918): 1-152.

[3] Nowhere is this more evident than in the success of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* (1706-1721), the anonymous "Grub Street" translation of Antoine Galland's *Mille et une nuits* (1704-1717); adaptations of this work are discussed in chapters 3 and 4. All eighteenth-century translations of the *Nights* were based on Galland's French translation until Edward W. Lane's bowdlerized *The Thousand and One Nights* (1838-1841).

from its relationship to French literature and culture. Focusing here on the English adaptations of two of Voltaire's "Mohammedan" plays as examples of this relationship, Aaron Hill's *The Tragedy of Zara* (1735) from *Zaïre* (1733) and James Miller's *Mahomet the Imposter* (1744) from *Le fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète* (1743), I argue that English adaptations increase the representation of sentiment in order to heighten the potential for sympathetic exchange through simultaneous identification with the imagined suffering represented onstage as well as the actors' own affective labor in that representation. This increased sympathetic potential has more complicated implications when the Orient is represented, as Britain negotiates greater contact with foreign bodies through an emotional process that may not be within their total control.

Oriental Tragedy and Sympathy

Sympathetic identification is important for understanding why and how Eastern figures in particular were configured as tragic. In Adam Smith's well-known passage about sympathetic identification from *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, he argues that we feel another's emotions through active identification: "By the imagination we place ourselves in his situation, we conceive ourselves enduring all the same torments, we enter as it were into his body, and become in some measure the same person with him, and thence form some idea of his sensations, and even feel something which, though weaker in degree, is not altogether unlike them."[4] The process requires the voluntary initiation of the sympathizer, with a purposeful act of imagination. Sympathy is strongest when the sympathizer and the sympathized are most similar in situation and affective response: "Nothing pleases us more than to observe in other men a fellow-feeling with all the emotions of our own

[4] Adam Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, ed. A.L. Macfie and D. D. Raphael (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1984), I.i.2.

breast; nor are we ever so much shocked as by the appearance of the contrary."[5] While our modern conception of empathy primacies the imagining of another's suffering, Smith posits that this imaginative projection produces the corporeal effects of emotion. The division between the two sympathizing bodies becomes confused, as the two people "in some measure" transform into the same being. An Oriental tragedy such as *Zara*, for example, seeks to find common ground for the audience who, like the heroine, are caught between two worlds.

For Hume, sympathy does not require the imaginative action found in Smith's theory. Rather, sympathy is a corporeal process that cannot be completely controlled by either actor: "When any affection is infus'd by sympathy, it is at first known only by its effects, and by those external signs in the countenance and conversation, which convey an idea of it. This idea is presently converted into an impression, and acquires such a degree of force and vivacity, as to become the very passion itself, and produce an equal emotion, as any original affection."[6] The sympathetic exchange is involuntary, and, contrary to Smith's belief that the sympathizer feels the emotions in a lesser degree than the subject, for Hume the sympathizer feels the emotions just as strongly. Hume's theory of sympathy creates tension in the relationship between the process of sympathetic exchange and the desire to participate; if sympathy is not created through an active process, then sympathy can be exchanged involuntarily but also in an unwanted fashion.

Theatrical practice in the eighteenth century often draws attention to the artifice of performance in a way that can feel proto-Brechtian, in that the artifice of the theater can be the most effective way of exploring true emotion. According to Kames, on the other hand, sympathetic exchange occurs in the space of ideal presence, the physical and mental space where impressions are created either through emotional memory or through emotional responses to fictional

[5] Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, I.i.14.

[6] David Hume, *A Treatise on Human Nature*, ed. L.A. Selby-Bigge (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), 317.

representations. Ideal presence could be formed through the memory of personal experience, but it is paradoxically best experienced through theatrical representation: "Of all the means for making an impression of ideal presence, theatrical representation is the most powerful. That words independent of action have the same power in a less degree, every one of sensibility must have felt: a good tragedy will extort tears in private, though not so forcibly as upon the stage."[7] Not only is tragedy the ideal form of sympathetic communication, but the actual performance is more important than the text itself. Like Hume's tragic eloquence, for Kames sympathy is most potent in the stage's constructed environment, rather than in the quotidian. One will experience the same emotion in both read and performed tragedy, but theatrical performance will produce the bodily response of tears (which, according to Kames, does not happen to the same extent when tragedy is read), because the encounter with other human emotions produces the strongest sympathetic response, privileging the physical proximity of bodies over imaginative identification.

Theater's strength for Kames is not that the audience will identify with tragic characters, which is true across fictional forms, but that bodies are brought into contact through affect; Oriental tragedy raises the stakes by bringing Eastern bodies into emotional contact to provide sympathetic exchange. Oriental tragedy thus brings the exotic within the boundaries of the homeland, and the fact that it is merely a representation of the foreign paradoxically increases the danger it poses by creating an environment of heightened sympathetic potential. Contemporary theories of acting mirror the competing theories of sympathy, complicating the discourse surrounding the relationship between actor and character. According to earlier theories of acting, the actor literally infects the space around him or her with the passions, both the material surroundings and the bodies of the spectators.[8] This kind of contagion that exceeds ordinary boundaries has been called "horrid

[7] Henry Home, Lord Kames, *Elements of Criticism* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2005), 1:58.

[8] Joseph Roach, *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting* (Ann Arbor: Michigan Univ. Press, 1993), 27.

sympathy" by Jonathan Lamb.[9] As is the case of Hume's theory of sympathy, the danger of the relationship between actor and spectator is that the spectator cannot control his or her emotional responses to the performance.

The reason drama was the most powerful form for Kames, in the art's ability to provoke sincere emotional reaction famously made Jean-Jacque Rousseau advocate against the theater. In the *Social Contract*, Rousseau is suspicious that the feeling brought out in performance could be felt even more strongly than what that same person would experience in society:

> Such is the pure emotion of nature, prior to all kinds of reflection! Such is the force of natural compassion, which the greatest depravity of morals has as yet hardly been able to destroy! for we daily find at our theatres men affected, nay shedding tears at the sufferings of a wretch who, were he in the tyrant's place, would probably even add to the torments of his enemies; like the blood-thirsty Sulla, who was so sensitive to ills he had not caused, or that Alexander of Pheros who did not dare to go and see any tragedy acted, for fear of being seen weeping with Andromache and Priam, though he could listen without emotion to the cries of all the citizens who were daily strangled at his command.[10]

Natural passions can overwhelm the knowledge that what is being dramatized onstage is not real; the spectator does not have the agency to affect the production of sentiment, unless they, like Alexander of Pheros, decline to go to see tragedy at all. This view holds with the mechanistic theories of the bodies that appeared in the second half of the eighteenth century, which argued that certain passions produced particular corporeal symptoms. The body was expected to react in very

[9] Jonathan Lamb, *The Evolution of Sympathy in the Long Eighteenth Century* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2009), 114.

[10] Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract and Discourses*, trans. G.D.H. Cole (London and Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1923).

specific ways to each emotion.[11] This type of causal relationship echoes the logic of Smith's imaginative sympathy. The performances of actors are therefore about their ability to transform the body into expressing the bodily effects caused by the emotions of the characters. Part of the pleasure of theater comes from the recognition that the actors are engaging in a physical feat; their skill involved transforming a corporeal surface to suggest the inaccessible interior of emotions.[12] Hill was a great believer in the mechanical theory of acting, going so far as to cast his inexperienced nephew (also named Aaron Hill) as the Sultan Osman, and extensively coaching Susannah Cibber for her debut.[13] Cibber herself embodied the ideological tension between spontaneity and acting: while an acolyte of Hill's theories, she was also noted for the strong emotional effect she exerted on audiences, and her lifetime ownership of the role of Zara suggests a personal magnetism that could not be replicated.[14]

Oriental tragedy's reliance on the star performances of actresses like Cibber makes it continuous with, rather than a break from, the other major form of eighteenth-century tragedy, "she-tragedy," both previously in the Restoration, as I argue in the previous chapter, and reaching later into the eighteenth century. She-tragedy, in Laura Brown's definition, "[preferred] pity to admiration and passive virtue to heroic self-assertion, and [turned] consistently to private citizens, domestic material, and female protagonists."[15] Oriental tragedy follows many of the same tenets,

---

[11] Roach, *The Player's Passion*, 58-91.

[12] Emily Hodgson Anderson, *Eighteenth-Century Authorship and the Play of Fiction: Novels and the Theater, Haywood to Austen* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 9.

[13] Fred L. Bergmann, "Garrick's *Zara*," *PMLA* 74, no. 3 (1959): 226.

[14] *Zara* ran for fourteen consecutive nights in 1736, establishing Susannah Cibber's reputation as a dramatic actress. A permanent part of David Garrick's repertoire when he began playing Lusignan in 1754, it was frequently performed and reprinted into the nineteenth century. Sometime in the 1760s Garrick's alteration to Hill's play became the dominant performance text, most likely after Cibber's death in 1766 (Bergmann, "Garrick's *Zara*," 227).

[15] Laura Brown, *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1993): 66. See also Jean Marsden's *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage, 1660-1720* (Ithaca:

focusing on female protagonists caught between competing paternal loyalty and romantic desires. Despite the Orientalized settings, one foreign location is often presented as the more civilized nation, as a way of establishing a domesticated stand-in for the English nation. Yet this new domestic focus does not regulate tragic feeling exclusively as it pertains to the private sphere. Brett Wilson has persuasively argued that she-tragedy worked to define national civic virtue by using affect generated by staged female suffering to create public spirit.[16] For example, the character of Zara may be equally as foreign to English audiences as her Sultan captor Osman, but her Christianity domesticates her while Osman remains the Other.

Similarly, both identification with Zara's suffering and the attention to the performativity of that suffering increase the potential for sympathetic exchange, creating a public united by affect.[17] For Voltaire, the depiction of affect is crucial to its envisioning of nation: "I swear that there will be nothing so Turkish, so Christian, so full of love, so tender, so furious as what I am writing at present to please them…I will paint the manners as accurately as possible, and try to put in the work the greatest pathos and interest offered by Christianity and the greatest pathos and interest offered by love."[18] In *Zaïre*, affect and pathos are integral to the play's national concerns, a relationship that is highlighted in Hill's translation. While *Zara* is a more obvious continuation of the she-tragedies of the Restoration, *Mahomet the Imposter* also seems to have operated in a similar mode, with the tragedy's pathos centered on Palmira (who dies by suicide to avoid Mahomet's assault). That shift to

---

Cornell Univ. Press, 2006) for a more extensive discussion of she-tragedy in the early eighteenth century. For more on the relationship between Oriental and she-tragedy, see Chapter One.

[16] See Brett Wilson, *A Race of Female Patriots: Women and the Public Spirit on the British Stage, 1688-1745* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell Univ. Press, 2011).

[17] See Bridget Orr, "Empire, Sentiment, and Theatre," in *The Oxford Handbook of The Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, ed. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 621-37.

[18] Voltaire, 29 May 1732, in Martin Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre of the Eighteenth Century* (Westport and London: Greenwood Press, 1998), 42.

the female protagonist is so great that the play was also known as *Mahomet and Palmira*.[19] While the title and central conflict of *Mahomet* suggests a drama focused on the intrareligious conflict between powerful men, the performance and casting history suggests instead that the sentimental pleasure was located in the pathos of Palmira's doomed situation. While this collapsing of the pathos of women with nation marks a departure for French tragedy, on the English stage these plays reinterpret a previously successful genre and linkage.

National Tragedies: Voltaire and Shakespeare

In prologues and prefaces, Voltaire's tragedies were situated as taking the best of French culture and mixing it with English power and sentiment. What exactly made tragic affect particularly British was defined not through the works of currently working dramatists, but through the tragedies of Shakespeare. Much has been written about the development of the cult of bardolatry in the eighteenth century, formulating Shakespeare as a symbol of British national identity.[20] What has been less explored is the crucial part that the French writer Voltaire had in this process, not just through his active work in promoting and criticizing Shakespeare[21] but also in the way he was placed

[19] Mary Ann Yates played Palmira in the 1767-68 and 1771-72 seasons at Covent Garden, and the role chosen for benefit performances by a Miss Hamilton in 1771 and by Sarah Siddons in 1795, opposite John Philip Kemble as Zaphna.

[20] Important studies of eighteenth-century bardolatry include Jonathan Bate, *Shakespeare and the English Romantic Imagination* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1986) and *Shakespearean Constitutions: Politics, Theatre, Criticism, 1730-1830* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989); Gary Taylor, *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989); Michael Dobson, *The Making of a National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992); Jean Marsden's *The Re-Examined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1995); Maximillian E. Novak, "The Politics of Shakespeare Criticism in the Restoration and Early Eighteenth Century," *ELH* 81, no. 1 (2014): 115-42; Fiona Ritchie and Peter Sabor, eds., *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press,2012) Fiona Ritchie, *Women and Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2014).

[21] For more on the history of Shakespeare in France, and Voltaire's contributions in particular, see John Pemble, *Shakespeare Goes to Paris: How the Bard Conquered France* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2005).

as Shakespeare's symbolic French counterpart, a metric for British writers to assess Shakespeare's work and legacy against the contemporary defender and innovator of French neoclassical tragedy.

Voltaire was first exposed to Shakespeare during his exile in England from 1726 to 1728, after one of many stints in the Bastille (this time for challenging the Chevalier Rohan-Chabot to a duel after the latter insulted him in actress Adrienne Lecouveur's theater box). Colley Cibber gave Voltaire a complementary orchestra seat at Drury Lane every night during his exile in England,[22] giving Voltaire the opportunity to take in much of London theater. Shakespeare was more or less unknown through most of France, but Voltaire's arrival in England came at the beginning of the Shakespeare textual editing craze,[23] with new *belles lettres* and commercial interest in the complete works. Voltaire had mixed feelings about Shakespeare because the bard did not conform to the neoclassical conventions so important in French tragedy but recognized the dramatic power of the works. Voltaire felt he was an unruly "English Corneille,"[24] but one whose genius was so singular that it could not be imitated, limiting the potential for a competing tradition to rival the neoclassical tenets.[25]

While Voltaire maintained his adherence to the principles of French neoclassical tragedy,[26] he sought to modernize the form, and he turned to Shakespeare for inspiration. After his return

---

[22] Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre*, 23.

[23] Voltaire arrived the year after the first edition of Alexander Pope's edition of *The Works of Shakespear* (1725), the second edited edition of Shakespeare's work after Nicholas Rowe's *The Works of William Shakespear* (1709). That year also saw the publication of Lewis Theobald's *Shakespeare restored: or, a Specimen of the Many Errors, as well Committed, as Unamended, by Mr. Pope in his Late Edition of this Poet. Designed Not only to correct the said Edition, but to restore the True Reading of Shakespeare in all the Editions ever yet publish'd* (1726).

[24] Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre*, 25-26.

[25] Eric Gidal, "'A gross and barbarous composition': Melancholy, National Character, and the Critical Reception of *Hamlet* in the Eighteenth Century," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 39 (2010): 243.

[26] French tragedy was governed by the principles of *vraisemblence* (the adherence to truth, as defined by reason and moral sense rather than by realism; meaning vice punished and virtue rewarded), *convenance* (authenticity and historical accuracy), and, most importantly, *bienséance* (propriety, with no reference to carnal or corporeal behavior). With regard to Aristotle's unities, strict adherence to the unity of subject was demanded (no subplots or

from England he began to incorporate elements of Shakespearean tragedy into his own drama, such as using global settings (including the Orient), minimizing or eliminating romantic storylines in mythical and historical plots, increasing the number of characters, depicting ghosts and corpses onstage, and incorporating more dramatic action with less descriptive *récit*.[27] At the same time, he became known in England as a major Shakespeare detractor; Voltaire believed that there was no skill in blank verse composition and that Shakespeare flouted both the unities and principles of decorum, though he excused the latter as emblematic of the Elizabethans' overall barbarity.[28] Worse, it was in part Voltaire's public engagement with Shakespeare led to the growing cult of bardolatry on the Continent that threatened to obscure France's homegrown tragedy.[29] His equivocal introduction of Shakespeare to France, still the cultural capital of Europe, magnified Shakespeare's influence on a global scale.[30]

Elizabeth Montagu's *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespear…With Some Remarks Upon the Misrepresentations of Mons. De Voltaire* is, as the title suggests, an explicit response to Voltaire's characterization of Shakespeare's writings. Yet Voltaire and Montagu have very similar readings of Shakespeare in relation to dramatic aesthetics; the point of contention emerges at the role of originality in dramatic writing. Montagu makes no attempt to defend Shakespeare against all of

---

intermixture of comedy), while the unities of time and place were less important. For more on French tragedy, see Pemble, *Shakespeare Goes to Paris,* 32-34; Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre*, 11-42; Henry Carrington Lancaster, *French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire, 1715-1774* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1950); Mathé Allain, "Voltaire et la fin de la tragédie classique française, *The French Review* 39, no. 3 (1965): 384-93.

[27] Pemble, *Shakespeare Goes to Paris*, 35-36. Voltaire's attempt to show a death scene onstage, however, turned out to be a bridge too far for his audiences.

[28] R.W. Babcock, "The English Reaction against Voltaire's Criticism of Shakespeare," *Studies in Philology* 27, no. 4 (1930): 612.

[29] John R. Iverson, "The First French Literary Centenary: National Sentiment and the Molière Celebration of 1773," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 31 (2002): 150-51.

[30] Pemble, *Shakespeare Goes to Paris*, xv.

Voltaire's critiques, but rather claims that Shakespeare's dramatic "originality" makes it understandable that he would not always successfully deviate from convention:

> Great indulgence is due to the errors of original writers, who, quitting the beaten track which others have travelled, make daring incursions into unexplored regions of invention, and boldly strike into the pathless sublime: it is no wonder if they are often bewildered, sometimes benighted; yet surely it is more eligible to partake the pleasure and the toil of their adventures, than still to follow the cautious steps of timid imitators through trite and common roads.[31]

Anticipating William Gilpin's definition of the picturesque by a decade, Montagu translates writing into the visual. Shakespeare's originality also preserves his Englishness: he is never attended university, with his "small Latin and less Greek,"[32] and thus his inspiration comes not from the classical education of Christopher Marlowe or Edmund Spenser, nor is it influenced by time spent on the Continent, as with Philip Sidney.[33] If Shakespeare is a true original in his art, then the only source for his genius can be in England. In Montagu's formulation, his language becomes the English land itself.

Montagu's critique of French tragedy uses much of the same language that demarcates adapted plays in theatrical prologues, employing metaphors of clothing and appropriate adornment: "Can they who have robbed the tragic muse of all her virtue, and divested her of whatsoever gave

---

[31] Elizabeth Montagu, *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespear, Compared with the Greek and French Dramatic Poets. With Some Remarks Upon the Misrepresentations of Mons. de Voltaire* (London: J. Dodsley, Baker and Leigh, J. Walter, T. Cadell, J. Wilkie), 8.

[32] Ben Jonson, "To the Memory of My Beloved the Author, Mr. William Shakespeare," in *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, vol. B, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Barbara K. Lewalski, George Logan, and Katharine Eisaman Maus (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 2012), 31.

[33] Shakespeare as a domestic genius was also politically gendered, and many female critics emphasized how Shakespeare's limited formal education and travel associated this English genius with the experiences of women. See Elizabeth Eger, "'Out Rushed a Female to Protect the Bard': The Bluestocking Defense of Shakespeare," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65, no. 1/2 (2002): 141-42.

her a real interest in the human heart, require we should adore her for the glitter of a few false brilliants, or the nice arrangement of frippery ornaments? If she wears any thing of intrinsic value it has been borrowed from the ancients; but by these artists it is so fantastically fashioned to modern modes, as to lose all its original graces, and even that necessary qualification of all ornaments, fitness and propriety."[34] The language of adaptation removes any possibility that French tragedy contains anything "natural," one of the defining characteristics of Shakespeare in Montagu's argument. But unlike English adaptations which consider the "necessary qualification[s]" of "fitness and propriety" in adapting texts, anything French tragedy has changed from classical tragedy is superficial and decadent.

For all of Montagu's elevation of originality, English theater of the period was marked by its lack of originality. The Licensing Act of 1737, passed about a decade after the end of Voltaire's English exile and in force for almost a generation by the writing of the *Essay*, meant that eighteenth-century theater was dominated by revivals and adaptations. Even before the act, however, fidelity to the original language was not a defining characteristic of Shakespearean performance. While collected Shakespeare editions were available, the performance texts of Shakespeare's plays were all adaptations, many originating in the Restoration.[35] As Jean I. Marsden argues, these "radical adaptations" believed Shakespeare's ideas were where his genius lay, not in the words themselves, a formulation that shifted with the industry of publishing of Shakespeare's works in early eighteenth century.[36]

---

[34] Montagu, *Essay on Shakespear*, 31-32.

[35] Some of the adaptations that continued to play throughout the eighteenth century include Sir William Davenant's *Macbeth* (1664); Davenant and John Dryden's *The Tempest, or the Enchanted Island* (1674); Colley Cibber's *The Tragical History of Richard III* (1700); and Nahum Tate's much-maligned *The History of King Lear* (1681), with a happy ending.

[36] Marsden, *The Re-Imagined Text*, 16-17.

In contrast, French neoclassical tragedy gains its power in part from the self-aware connection of a given play to the longer tradition of tragedy. For Montagu, this is to the detriment of French dramatists, whom she claims merely imitate the precedent set by Corneille and Racine. But Voltaire actively engaged with this precedent as a productive element of the artistic process. Voltaire's first tragedy *Oedipe* (1719) takes on the subject of Sophocles' exemplar of Greek tragedy, and in the seventeenth century it was incorporated into French neoclassical tragedy with a version by Corneille. In the first published edition, Voltaire even includes a series of letters in which he compares his Oedipus tragedy to those of his predecessors.[37] While eighteenth-century English playwrights were adapting and updating older texts, Voltaire and other French dramatists turned to creating original works based on a set of popular and/or significant topics.

English views of French culture echoed their views of French government during the *ancien régime*, constricted by tyrannical autocracy. To a certain extent, French theater did work within a number of restrictions imposed by the establishment (the court, the censor, and the church), and Parisian audiences were also notorious for enforcing a narrow sense of what belonged on the stage. In contrast, the English audience has autonomy that crosses from the political to the aesthetic: "He can discern between the natural language in which she addressed the human heart, and the artificial dialect which she has acquired from the prejudices of a particular nation, or the jargon caught from the tone of a court."[38] The spectator is able to adjudicate the artistic merits, where the greater the political power means the weaker the aesthetic value.

French cultural products were often presented as part of a larger referendum on the nation's political and religious structures. Two days before the premiere of *Mahomet the Imposter* at Drury

---

[37] Voltaire, *Oedipe, tragedie. Par Monsieur de Voltaire*, (A Paris: Chez Pierre Ribou, Quay des Augustins, vis-à-vis la descente du Pont-Neuf, à l'Image saint Louis. Au Palais: Chez Pierre Huet, sur le second Perron de la Ste Chapelle, au Soleil Levant. Jean Mazuel, au Palais, et Antoine-Urbain Coustelier, Quay des Augustins, 1719).

[38] Montagu, *An Essay on Shakespear*, 3.

Lane, a letter to the author of the *General Advertiser* appeared in a playbill for *The Double Dealer*, connecting the rigidity of French tragedy with the political suppression of Voltaire's play in France and the religious persecution of Protestants:

> The Original was by Authority forbid to be played in France on account of the free and noble Sentiments with regard to Bigotry and Enthusiasm, which shine through it; and which that Nation found as applicable to itself, as to the bloody propagators of Mahomet's Religion. Indeed the Fable on which it is built demanded such sentiments…So that it was equally impossible for the poet, by cutting and mangling his play, to lop it to their standard of Orthodox poetry, as it were for their Inquisitors, by torturing and burning a poor protestant, to convince him of their Christian love and charity.[39]

The rigidity of France's dramatic tradition is conflated with the Catholic Church's persecution of Protestants, and the editing and adaptation process is described as a form of execution. The language of adaptation is brought to bear on an original work by Voltaire since the "original" play must be brought to heel; whereas the "free and noble Sentiments" of the play are able to get their proper airing on the English stage.

Bringing Voltaire to the English stage in and of itself highlighted the liberty of the English theater (ignoring the fact that London theaters were restricted to the two royal patent theaters and to state censorship), and the English adaptations emphasize the Shakespearean elements of Voltaire's Oriental tragedies. *Zara* most directly borrows from Shakespeare, with a great Sultan brought down by his own jealousy. In the play, Zara (Zaïre in the French) and Nerestan, Christian slaves captured in the thirteenth-century Muslim raid on Cesarea, were raised in the court of the Sultan Osman (Orosmane) in Jerusalem. After Nerestan was granted permission to go to France to raise a ransom

[39] *The Double Dealer*, 23 April 1744 in *The London Stage, 1660-1800*, ed. Arthur H. Scouten (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1962), 1104.

for the other Christian slaves, he returns on the wedding day of Osman and Zara, who have to his dismay fallen in love in his absence. Loyal to Osman, Zara does not wish to be freed, but escorts Lusignan, an elderly slave descended from the Christian princes of Jerusalem, to Nerestan's camp. Lusignan recognizes the cross she wears, and realizes that Nerestan and Zara are his children. Determined to prevent her marriage to a Muslim, Nerestan and Lusignan urge Zara to see a priest that night in order to be baptized. After an agonizing deliberation, Zara decides to see the priest but remain with Osman and confess her religion, confident he will pity her struggle. Osman intercepts the letter from Nerestan arranging a meeting between Zara and the priest, but believes Nerestan and Zara are lovers. Osman interrupts the meeting in a jealous rage, arrests Nerestan and stabs Zara. On discovering his error, he is filled with guilt and remorse; he frees the Christian slaves and kills himself.

The connections between *Zara* and *Othello* were often pointed by commentators, including their shared Ottoman context. In particular, the depictions of jealousy, the green-eyed monster:[40]

> "You were mentioning," said Mrs. ———, " Voltaire's imitation of Othello, in this tragedy; I recollect, in the last act, a very strong instance of it, the concluding speech of Osman, before he stabs himself, which seems to be exactly taken from that of the Moor, in a similar situation."——"I remember both speeches well," said Sir H———, and I think it may be disputed whether either of them be congenial to the situation,"——"You will excuse me, Sir H———,"said I, " if I hold them both perfectly in nature. The calmness of desperate and irremediable grief will give vent to a speech longer and more methodical than the immediate anguish of some less deep and irretrievable calamity. Shakespeare makes Othello refer, in the

[40] For more detailed comparisons between *Othello* and *Zaïre*, see Thomas Lounsbury, *Shakespeare and Voltaire* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902) and E.J. Dubedout, "Shakespeare et Voltaire: 'Othello' et 'Zaïre,'" *Modern Philology* 3, no. 3 (1906): 305-16. Other literary sources for *Zaïre* are considered in Alexander Haggerty Krappe, "The Source of Voltaire's 'Zaïre'," *The Modern Language Review* 20, no. 3 (1925): 305-9; for historical sources see Robert E. Pike, "Fact and Fiction in *Zaïre*," *PMLA* 51, no. 2 (1936): 436-39.

> instant of stabbing himself, to a story of his killing a Turk in Aleppo; the moment of perturbation, when such a passage would have been unnatural, is past; the act of killing himself is then a matter of little importance; and his reference to a story seemingly indifferent, marks, in my opinion, most forcibly and naturally, the deep and settled horror of Othello's soul. I prefer it to the concluding lines of the Sultan's Speech in Zara, which rest on the story of his own misfortune: 'Tell'em I plung'd my dagger in her breast; / Tell'em, I so ador'd, and thus reveng'd her.'"[41]

The final speeches of Othello and Osman before suicide are similar in expressing regret for their false jealousy of their beloveds, but the fact that Othello turns to a seemingly unrelated topic before stabbing himself becomes a point in favor of English realism over French unity of subject. But the relationship between *Othello* and *Zara* is more complicated than translating Othello to Osman and Desdemona to Zara. Like Osman, Othello's jealousy drives him to kill his beloved, but like Zara he rather than Desdemona is also a figure caught between cultures.

Given the obvious debt that many of Voltaire's tragedies had to Shakespeare, the English translations often use phrases and vocabulary that resonate with the Shakespearean sources. In *Sémiramis* (1750) Voltaire takes an indirect influence from Shakespeare that becomes more explicit in George Ayscough's English adaptation of his play. Taking inspiration from the Ghost in *Hamlet*, the ghost of the murdered king Ninus appears to his wife Queen Sémiramis, who conspired to murder him with Assures for the throne, and his son Arzaces. As the Shade retreats into the tomb, he promises his wife and son that they will follow them there: "Forbear; / But rest assur'd the hour now hastens on / When 'twill be lawful for thee to descend / Into this house of death[42]." Translated

[41] *The Mirror,* 31 July 1779.

[42] George Ayscough, *Semiramis, a Tragedy: as it is acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane* (London: Printed for J. Dodsley, in Pall-Mall, 1776), III.vi, p. 46.

literally, Voltaire's text emphasizes the respect for the dead king's tomb.[43] While not straying far from this meaning, Ayscough's emphasis on temporality over the tomb simultaneously recalls the Ghost's farewell to Hamlet: "My Hour is almost come, / When I to sulph'rous tormenting Flames / Must render up myself."[44] The second is to refocus attention on the performance of sentiment. This scene in particular seems to be a touchpoint for the tensions between French and English tragedy. In a revival of *Sémiramis* at the Comédie française in 1756, the actor Henri-Louis Lekain as the ghost of Ninus emerged from his tomb "with sleeves rolled back, arms bloody, hair disordered, and eyes starting." Despite the scene's obvious debt to Shakespeare, Voltaire described this kind of dramatic realism as "too English."[45] For him, dramatic tension should not come at the expense of French artistry and taste.

"Teach a languid nation how to feel": Sympathy and Cosmopolitanism

The debate between the tragedies of Shakespeare and Voltaire is at its core an attempt to litigate genre, which was defined in part along national lines; but the prevalence of English adaptations of French plays, in particular plays set in the Middle and Far East, suggests the porousness of the very generic boundaries that Montagu and others attempted to delineate.[46] Britain's attempts at articulating the purpose of tragedy look to their nearest neighbor; Adam Smith contrasts the vehemence of English hatred about the French to their relative indifference to the

[43] "Arrête, et respecte ma cendre, / Quand il en sera temps, je t'y ferai descendre. / [*Le spectre rentre, et les mauzolée se referme*.]" (Voltaire, *La tragédie de Sémiramis* [Dublin: Imprimé chez S. Powell, en Crane-Lane, 1750]), III.vi, p. 63. Stop, and respect my ashes, / When it is time, I will get you down there. (Unless otherwise cited, all translations are my own.)

[44] William Shakespeare, *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. A tragedy. By William Shakespear. Collated with the best editions* (London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, 1743), I.iii, p. 16.

[45] Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre*, 104.

[46] This tension is characteristic of genre as category; see Jacques Derrida, "The Law of Genre," trans. Avital Ronell, *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1980): 55-81.

cultural strength of Eastern nations: "National prejudices and hatreds seldom extend beyond neighbouring nations. We very weakly and foolishly, perhaps, call the French our natural enemies; and they perhaps, as weakly and foolishly, consider us in the same manner. Neither they nor we bear any sort of envy to the prosperity of China or Japan. It very rarely happens, however, that our good-will towards such distant countries can be exerted with much effect."[47] *Zara* and *Mahomet* were marks of expanding cosmopolitanism, as English translations of a French tragedy, in comparison to the work of an English playwright whose status as a national figure was consolidating in this period. At the same time, these Oriental tragedies do evidence an interest in cultures farther afield, even if mediated by France. The theater offers an imaginative space where Eastern and European representations coexist.

Oriental tragedies translated from Voltaire were seen not directly as "Anglicizing" a French text, but by bringing Voltaire to the English stage the theaters were recognizing the hybridity of Voltaire's writing: "[*Zara*] is borrowed originally from the Zaire of M. de Voltaire, an author, who, while he resided in England, imbibed so much of British liberty, that his writings seem almost calculated for the meridian of London. Mr. Aaron Hill, however, has made this, as well as his own, that it is hard to determine which of the two may most properly be called the author of this play."[48] *Zara* is inscribed as a national property both through Hill's involvement and through Voltaire's knowledge of the British theatre. The prologue to *Mahomet* credits Voltaire's exposure to British culture for the play's civic spirit: "*Britons*, those Numbers to yourselves you owe; / *Voltaire* hath Strength to shoot in *Shakespear*'s Bow: / Fame led him at his *Hippocrene* to drink, / And taught to write with *Nature* as to think: / With *English* Freedom, *English* Wit he knew, / And from the

[47] Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 229-30.

[48] *The Whitehall Evening Post; or, London Intelligencer*, 21 October 1766.

inexhausted Stream profusely drew."[49] Voltaire ingests Shakespeare's English genius in his works, and so in a transitive mode the British audiences are responsible for the power of this play. This framing not only defends English tragedy against claims about French superiority, it rhetorically brings in the defender of French neoclassicism as an example of Shakespearean tragedy. A similar national fusion occurs in Colley Cibber's prologue to *Zara*, in which the play's authorship is described as both French and English: "'Tis strange, that Nature never should inspire / A *Racine*'s Judgment with a *Shakespeare*'s Fire! / Howe'er, to-night, — (to promise much we're loth) / But—— you've a Chance, to have a Taste of Both."[50] Cibber writes how Voltaire fuses the formal excellence of the French neoclassical tradition with the affective strength of British tragedy. In this framing, part of the enjoyment of Voltaire's plays on the English stage is the "palimpsestic pleasure"[51] of seeing two texts and two artistic traditions fused into one production.

This attempt to appropriate French tragedy as providing evidence for British liberty and cultural strength hints at the anxiety felt around the artistic merit of the London theaters. Many eighteenth-century British playwrights and critics felt dramatic tragedy was in crisis[52]. In his introduction to *Zara*, Hill is actively trying to reinstate tragedy's importance in English culture, a process he expects will be realized through sympathetic exchange. In an inversion of Republican stoicism, civic virtue is linked to the feeling and the expression of sentiment, not its repression. Hill's dedication to the printed edition of *Zara* seeks to police the feelings aroused by tragedy and he

---

[49] James Miller and James Hoadley, *Mahomet the Imposter. A Tragedy as it is Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury Lane, by his Majesty's Servants. By Mr. Voltaire* (Edinburgh: Printed by J. Baillie and Company, 1755), prologue. All citations to *Mahomet the Imposter* are cited parenthetically within the text.

[50] Aaron Hill, *The Tragedy of Zara, As it is acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. By His Majesty's Servants* (London1735), prologue, http://find.galegroup.com/ecco. All subsequent citations are in the text.

[51] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 173.

[52] See Felicity A. Nussbaum, "The Challenge of Tragedy," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, ed. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 368-89; and "The Unaccountable Pleasure of Eighteenth-Century Tragedy," *PMLA* 129, no. 4 (2014): 688-707.

hopes to evoke appropriate emotional response: "Charming, *be* charm'd! the *Stage's* Anguish *heal*: / And teach a languid People *how* to *feel*" (dedication). But here the performance of tragedy was in itself not enough to produce national unity, for audiences must be actively trained to recognize this unity. *Zara*'s printed introduction and the performed prologue discussed earlier both seek to prescribe appropriate affective response to tragedy and to articulate specific power relations between actors and audiences, men and women, and the British domestic and the exotic other.[53]

Hill in his dedication to *Zara* builds on the idea of sympathy as an unrestrained emotional response: "I had (of late) among the Rest of the Town, been depriv'd of all rational Pleasure from the Theatre, by a monstrous, and unmoving, Affectation: which, choaking up the Avenues to Passion, had made Tragedy FORBIDDING, and, HORRIBLE" (preface, 10). The process of expressing sympathy can actually be blocked by bad acting, both figuratively and literally unmoving. Hill's acting prescriptions were almost as much about physical wellbeing as cultural health. The distinction between desirable and undesirable emotional response is not based on complete identification with the theatrical characters, but rather on how the bodies and minds of audience members and actors manage to exchange feeling.

Hill believed the revival of tragedy could be encouraged through the power of actors, privileging the experience of performance over the quality of the texts themselves. In the introduction, Hill cites Susannah Cibber as an exemplar of acting skill, and he anticipated that her performance in the title role would be a key part of the play's success. Cibber's prologue to *Zara* (spoken by himself) emphasizes the potential for identification with the actress, rather than the character she plays:

When a chaste Heart's Distress your Grief demands,

[53] As Bridget Orr has argued, tragedy became a key component of nation-building by creating a unified people through a united affective response. See Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage, 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001).

One silent Tear outweighs a thousand Hands.

If she conveys the pleasing Passions, RIGHT,

Guard and Support her this decisive Night.

If she mistakes — or, finds her Strength too small,

Let interposing Pity – break her Fall.

In You it rests, to Save her, or Destroy;

If she draws Tears from You, I Weep – for Joy. (Prologue, 13-14)

While of course Cibber has an interest in promoting Susannah Cibber's performance (his daughter-in-law) over the tragic character, this prologue describes an active spectator that is common in descriptions of theatrical affect. In this construction of shared sentiment, theatrical affect is exchanged through tears: tears of sorrow from the audience's sympathy with the tragic subject will elicit tears of joy from the performers and authors, after the fact. Tears are an involuntary corporeal effect of sympathy, and are more desirable from rapt spectators than applause, the audience's voluntary expression of approval. The prologue to *Zara* positions identification with the actress over the character; the act of performance is the central emotional pull rather than the plot. In the age of the actress, as Felicity Nussbaum argues, the dramatic material is secondary to the bravura performance; privileging the bodies performing and spectating over the dramatic situation creates imaginative distance from the narrative that has the potential to increase rather than diminish emotional response.[54]

The formal structure of eighteenth-century theatrical performance calls attention to the skills of the performers in real time more than the creation of an alternate universe separated from the audience by a fourth wall. Prologues, epilogues, entr'actes, and after-pieces, often performed out of

[54] See Felicity A. Nussbaum, *Rival Queens: Actresses, Performance, and the Eighteenth-Century British Theater* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Univ. Press, 2010).

character, not only ruptured narrative cohesion but also drew attention to the abilities of specific actors. The economics of the theater also capitalized on the fame of star performers rather than requiring that their personal celebrity disappear into the role.[55] Eighteenth-century theater did not maintain a strong division between the world of the audience and that of the play, for actors and audiences sometimes engaged in exchanges, but neither was the stage narrative completely subsumed in the theater's role as a site of sociability for the audience.

The premiere of *The Tragedy of Zara* was a notorious example of this level of audience engagement, when Hill's nephew, not a professional actor, botched the opening performance of the male lead: "The Gentleman who perform'd the Character of Osman … the first Night, having since declin'd it, that Part was read last Night; and it being submitted to the Determination of the Audience, whether the Play should be continu'd, or the Repetition of it deferr'd till somebody was study'd in the Part, they unanimously declar'd for the Continuation of the Play; and 'twas desir'd the Part might be read till one of the Players could be studied in it."[56] The audience is figured as an equal player in the creation of theater; they adjudicate whether or not the performance will continue, and under what circumstances. Rather than attempt to hide the failings of the process of making theater, the audience involvement calls attention to the practical realities of stage business.

Not only is tragedy not diminished by an awareness of its "falsehood", but it is the awareness of fictionality that is at the heart of tragedy's power. This metatheatricality calls attention to the acknowledgement of the artifice inherent in dramatic and artistic endeavors. The pleasure of eloquence derives from feeling moved by the oratorical performance while the audience is simultaneously impressed by the actor's skill in creating feeling. In a newspaper account of a performance of *Zara* in Calcutta, the emotional power of the play is linked with the appreciation of

[55] Nussbaum, *Rival Queens,* 47.

[56] *Daily Advertiser,* 14 January 1736, in *The London Stage,* 543.

the actors' performances: "During the whole of the second act, the distress was truly affecting; and as the performers seemed to feel their parts, so did they communicate them with irresistible energy."[57] The spectator's response engages with the perceived energy of the performers, not just with the specific emotions of the characters. It is not that the actors are credited with actually sharing feelings with their characters, but it is in the "seeming" and their ability to communicate where the enjoyment of the tragedy lies.

In a critique of *Zara* presented as a dialogue in the Dublin paper *The Mirror*, the distinction between the actors' performances and the character's acting is elided: "'I do not believe, Mamma,' said the young lady, 'that she was really converted in opinion; but I don't wonder at her crying out she was a Christian, after such a speech as that of her father *Lusignan*. I know my heart was so wrung with the scene, that I could, at that moment, have almost become *Mahometan,* to have comforted the good old man.'"[58] The young lady doesn't believe that the character Zara's conversion is sincere, but Lusignan's speech is so powerful that the spectator would have become *Zara's* religion if it would comfort him. This reaction echoes Voltaire's larger philosophy, made explicit in *Zaïre*, that religious belief comes from social conditioning rather than though divine inspiration.[59] The division between actor and spectator is complicated, in that the young lady wants to comfort the "good old man," Lusignan embodied by the actor, but she would have inverted the conversion, in order for her to approximate the feelings of Zara onstage. Paradoxically, a play dramatizing Christian conversion makes the Islamic religion almost on par with Christianity in the affective exchange between actors and spectator.

---

[57] *Calcutta Gazette; or, Oriental Advertiser*, 15 December 1785.

[58] *The Mirror*, 31 July 1779.

[59] Clifton Cherpack, "Love and Alienation in Voltaire's *Zaïre*," *French Forum* 2, no. 1 (1977): 48.

Dramatizing Sentiment: Zaïre and Zara

I argue that metatheatricality actually increases the distance between the faraway Eastern tragic subjects and the English audience; in calling attention to the artificiality of stage performance metatheatricality increases the potential for sympathetic exchange between the theater professionals and the spectators. By metatheatricality I mean the ways in which the theatrical text calls the spectator's attention to the illusion of theater, rather than minimizes that connection through realism. Oriental tragedy plays with the competing ideas of sympathetic exchange, requiring both imaginative identification with the exotic characters and reminding viewers of the construction of difference on display: but it also opens the possibility of a contagion beyond the spectator's control that threatens to extend beyond the space of the theater. *The Tragedy of Zara* centers on the conflict between equally competing religions, nations, and personal loyalties, but does so in a way that draws attention to how the text dramatizes these categories as well as to the inherent performativity of these dichotomies. In doing so, it defies the easy moral or political categorization that would suppress the ambiguities of globalization.

Zara is caught between competing loyalties, between Christianity and Islam, between her father and her lover, and between personal ties and national concerns. Zara's tragedy is in part that while everyone around her (Lusignan, Nerestan, Osman, etc.) believes that her conflicts are irreconcilable, and that she must choose her Christian family or her Muslim lover, she thinks that she can fulfill both sides of herself.[60] However, the text of the play itself complicates these dichotomies. *Zara* draws attention to the performativity of all these categories, therefore destabilizing any easy prescriptivism.

[60] Caroline Weber, "Voltaire's *Zaïre*: Fantasies of Infidelity, Ideologies of Faith," *South Central Review* 21, no. 2 (2004): 51-52.

The metatheatricality of the play highlights how the characters' own actions within the narrative are also acts of performance. Osman's own kingship is, in effect, a theatrical role: "But Heaven, to blast that unbelieving Race, / Taught me, to *be* a King, by thinking *like* one" (I.i). In a sense, Osman is in the position of the audience, but instead of sympathizing with a specific actor, he is sympathizing with an office. Osman's kingship is also a metaphor for spectatorship; the audience develops the appropriate affective response to the character and the actor by thinking "like" them. The text also calls attention to the narrative as a performance event. As Osman approaches Zara, she speaks openly about the dramatic expectations of her audience: "At last, 'tis come – the fear'd, the murd'ring Moment / Is come – and I am curs'd by Earth, and Heaven!" (IV.i). Zara's own dramatic expectations vocalize the audience's own expectations; particularly in one of the most frequently performed plays of the eighteenth century, the audience and Zara herself are expecting the outcome, made inevitable through both the generic conventions of tragedy and a familiarity with the plot of the play.

While *The Tragedy of Zara* is a fairly straightforward translation of Voltaire's *Zaïre*, Hill is much more interested in affective description than is his source text. A striking example is when the slave Melidor reports to Osman, describing Zara's response to a clandestine meeting with the priest:

> She blush'd, and trembled, and grew pale, and paus'd;
> Then blush'd, and read it; and, again, grew pale;
> And wept, and smil'd, and doubted, and resolv'd:
> For, after all this Race of vary'd Passions,
> When she had sent me out, and call'd me back,
> Tell him (she cried) who has intrusted thee,
> That Zara's Heart is fix'd, nor shrinks at Danger;
> And, that my faithful Friend will, at the Hour,

Expect, and introduce him, to his Wish. (V.i)

While this description exists in Voltaire, it is not nearly as effusive as in Hill.[61] It gives a character and actor who is not one of the principals an opportunity to perform powerful feelings, who would otherwise not display this type of emotion within the dictates of the narrative, expanding further the potential objects of sympathy for the spectators.[62] This speech is also a metatheatrical performance of sympathy; Melidor is sympathizing with Zara's passions. The audience is able to sympathize with Melidor's engagement with Zara in addition to their sympathy with Zara herself. Melidor in this moment is the audience's stand-in onstage, allowing the spectators to see themselves reflected in the narrative.

The Tragedy of Zara gives a material reality to the heroine's negotiation of religious and national interests, making an internal struggle legible. Zara's Christianity is configured as a prop; the cross she wears has the power to engender strong affective responses in both her and others: "Yet, far from having lost the Rev'rence due, / This Cross, as often it meets by Eye, / Strikes thro' my Heart a kind of awful Fear!" (I.i). The focus on the cross as a symbol of faith evokes the Catholic context in which Voltaire writes (visual representation has stronger currency in Catholicism than in most branches of Protestantism, though it is certainly not antithetical to Anglicanism).[63] The cross is

---

[61] "Seigneur, / On n'a jamais senti de si vives alarmes. / Elle a pâli, tremblé, ses yeux versaient des larmes; / Elle m'a fait sortir, elle m'a rappelé, / Et d'une voix tremblante, et d'un coeur tout troublé, / Près de ces lieux, Seigneur, elle a promis d'attendre / Celui qui cette nuit à ses yeux doit se render" (Voltaire, *Zaïre*, ed. Jean Goldzink [Paris: GF Flammarion, 2004]: V.vi.1500-6). "Sir, one has never felt so alarmed. She turned pale, trembled, her eyes shedding tears; She took me out, she reminded me, and with a trembling voice, and a very troubled heart, beside them, sir, she promised to wait for whoever must render in this night according to him." All subsequent citations are in the text.

[62] Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606) has a famous example: "Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale / Her infinite variety; other women cloy / The appetites they feed, but she makes hungry / Where most she satisfies; for vilest things / Become themselves in her, that the holy priests / Bless her when she is riggish" (William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra* [New York: Washington Square Press, 1999], II.ii.271-66).

[63] Unsurprisingly, in *Zara* the description of this object is minimized. In *Zaïre*, Fatime's description reads: "Cette croix qui sur vous fut trouvée / Parure de l'enfance, avec soin conservée / Ce signe des Chrétiens, que l'art dérobe aux yeux, / Sous ce brillant éclat d'un travail précieux, / Cette croix, dont cent fois mes soins vous on parée, / Peut-être entre vos mains est-ell demeurée, / Come un gage secret de la fidélité / Que vous deviez au Dieu que vous avez quitté" (I.i.93-100). [This cross found on you / Dress of childhood, carefully preserved / This sign of

the visual representation of both the act of Christ's sacrifice and a geographic link to Calvary,[64] highlighting the play's geopolitics about the contested Holy Land, despite its dominant concern in the private melodrama.

Yet the cross on Zara's bosom also draws attention to the materiality of the ideological debate: "The Prop of all our Christian Hope is lost!" (II.i). In Voltaire's text, the connection to both structural and theatrical properties is not there: "The unhappy Christians's hope is betrayed" ("Des Chrétiens malheureux l'espérance est trahie") (II.i). Both the cross she wears and Zara herself are properties: the cross is a theatrical object (or prop), worn by Zara who is the metaphorical representative of the Christian slaves' hope. Further, the cross hanging on a necklace renders visible Zara's inner Christianity even before she herself is aware of it, and it draws attention to Zara's body, the site of contention between Osman and Lusignan. The cross would also have drawn attention to the actress's body as both a sympathetic and erotic object, the cross on the heaving bosom of the tragic actress emphasizing both the emotion being performed as well as the actress's body as a visually consumable object. The eighteenth-century theater is, of course, an economic space as well as an artistic one, and the objectification of Zara's religion and body draw attention to both her status and the actress's status as exchangeable products.

---

the Christians, which art conceals from the eyes, / Under this brilliant shine of precious labor, / This cross that I have adorned you with a hundred times, / Perhaps in your hands has it remained, / As a secret pledge of fidelity / That you owed to the God you left.] In *Zara*, Fatime becomes Selima, and this description is drastically conscribed: "*That* Cross, which, from your Infant Years, / Has been preserv'd, was found upon your Bosom, / As if design'd, by Heaven, a Pledge of Faith, / Due to the God, you purpose to forsake!" (I.i). Not only does this drastically reduce the attention paid to the specifics of the cross, but the focus of agency shifts from the human, Zaïre's subliminal Christian devotion (and the labor of the mortals who create that work of art), to the divine, as Heaven controls Zara's wearing of the cross. The difference between Voltaire's depiction of the material aspects of religion and its practice as inherited behavior, and the English translations, which water this down in favor of an Anglicanized depiction of faith, is even more apparent in *Mahomet*.

[64] L. Brian Price, "Spatial Relationships in Voltaire's *Zaïre*," *The French Review* 50, no. 2 (1976): 252.

In contrast to the performative emotion expected on the British stage, *French* neoclassical tragedy avoided the depiction of excessive affect[65]; with *Zaïre*, seeking to respectfully modernize tragedy, Voltaire moves the emotional register away from mythic awe towards empathy.[66] When the play is translated to English, the changes Hill makes to the text not only increases the affective language, but also emphasizes the similarities between Zara and Osman over their differences:

Orosmane. Zaïre, vous m'aimez!

Zaïre. Dieu! si je l'aime, hélas! (IV.ii)

In Hill's version, this is translated into more physical but also more hyperbolic terms:

Osman. Rise – rise – This means not Love? [Raises her]

Zara. Strike – Strike me, Heaven! (IV.i)

Voltaire's Orosmane directly declares Zaïre's love for him, which she confirms in straightforward French. Hill's English text gives Osman and Zara's lines parallel structures, coupling them formally and romantically. While Hill would appear to make what is a simple confirmation of love in Voltaire a melodramatic moment, Hill actually refocuses attention on the corporeal effects of love, and specifically stages the movement involved in the declaration. The text emphasizes the commonalities of Osman and Zara rather than their differences, positioning Osman as an equally tragic character. It also brings to the surface both their emotional states by translating Osman's feelings for Zara into an embodied theatrical action.

Even though the tragedy centers on Zara's conflict, Hill presents the Sultan Osman as an object of sympathy. Not only is his suffering presented as tragic, but he also explicitly demands sympathetic exchange between himself and the spectators:

---

[65] Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre*, 11.

[66] Manfred Kusch, "Old Certainties and the 'New Novel': The Problem of Authority in Voltaire's Theater and Prose Fiction," *French Forum* 9, no. 2 (1984): 192.

Osman. Horrors, a thousand times more dark, than these,

Benight my suff'ring Soul ---- Thou dost not know,

To what Excess of Tenderness, I lov'd her.

I knew no Happiness but what she gave me,

Nor cou'd have felt a Mis'ry, but for her!

Pity this Weakness ---- mine are Tears, Orasmin!

That fall not oft, nor lightly: -----

Orasmin. Tears! ---- Oh, Heaven!

Osman. The first, which, ever, yet, unmann'd my Eyes!

O! pity Zara ----- pity Me ----- Orasmin,

These but forerun the Tears of destin'd Blood.

Orasmin. Oh, my unhappy Lord! – I tremble for You. –

Osman. Do ---- tremble at my Suff'rings, at my Love;

At my Revenge, too, tremble ---- for, 'tis due,

And will not be deluded. (V.i)

While Orasmin's sympathy devolves from identification, imagining the sufferings of Zara and Osman, there is also the sense of the uncontrollability of Osman's passions. His horrors are a thousand times darker than he can express, and his love for Zara is excessive. If Orasmin and also the audience fully sympathize with Osman, there is the possibility that they too will experience emotion that refuses to be contained within the appropriate boundaries. That danger is alluded to in the text, where these tears are said to foreshadow the blood spilt at the play's conclusion. Uncontrollable emotion becomes uncontrollable violence, as Osman murders Zara in a mistaken jealous rage.

This moment is also metatheatrical in the way it calls attention to the embodiment of the actor's performance. Osman claims that he never weeps, but of course, in a play that ran for multiple performances a year and employed many of the same actors across many seasons, this is demonstrably untrue. On the one hand, this can be read as a moment of naturalism, where Osman's tears are truly Osman's own: their extreme rarity makes them seem more moving. On the other hand, this moment could be read as calling attention to the distance between actor and character, evoking the performativity of emotional response. Audiences would have seen the sultan's tears frequently and repeatedly; Osman's tears may be rare, but an actor's tears are not. Osman's tears become moving in part because of sympathetic identification with the character, but also from the appreciation of the skill of the performer; the sympathy for the latter does not preclude sympathy for the former. Osman is both a performer, the actor who portrays him, and a character who is performing his emotions for an onstage sympathizer. The scene reveals the performance of sympathy between performer and audience onstage even as it is creating that situation between its own performance and the spectators in the audience.

Osman's conflict between his love for Zara and his national duties echoes Zara's conflict, further cementing his status as a tragic figure:

> Return! – the Traitor! He returns. – Dares he
> Presume, to press a second Interview?
> Wou'd he be seen, again? – He shall be seen;
> But dead; - I'll punish the audacious Slave,
> To teach the faithless Fair, to feel my Anger:
> Be still, my transports; Violence is blind:
> I know, my Heart, at once, is fierce, and weak;
> I feel, that I descend, below myself…

Osman's speech is bifurcated between his love for Zara and his belief in her betrayal; between his desire to punish Nerestan and his wish to be a just monarch; and between the passion of his love and the demands of state. He is pulled between these competing interests within the lines of blank verse, changing his resolve and his object of concern with each dash. By consolidating the language of empire and emotion, Osman focuses on the course of action which brings the tragedy to its conclusion:

> Zara can, never, justly, be suspected;
> Her Sweetness, was not form'd, to cover Treason:
> Yet, Osman must not stoop to Woman's Follies.
> Their Tears, Complaints, Regrets, and Reconcilements,
> With all their light, capricious, Roll of Changes,
> Are Arts, too vulgar, to be try'd on Me.
> It would become, me, better to resume
> The Empire of my Will – Rather than fall
> Beneath myself, I must, how dear so'er
> It costs me, - rise till I look down, on Zara!
> Away – but mark me – these Seraglio Doors,
> Against all Christians, be they, henceforth shut,
> Close, as the dark Retreats of silent Death.
> What have I done, just Heav'n! thy Rage to move,
> That thou shoud'st sink me down, so low, to Love! (III.i)

This speech almost mirrors Zara's own deliberations, as Osman's love for Zara threatens to impede his performance of his political duties. But he also dramatizes the danger of incomplete sympathy. Osman cannot sympathize with Zara because he misinterprets the markers of emotions displayed

through her body, as performed by the actress who plays her. In this tragedy, Hill's fears that bad acting blocks the passageways for true sympathy to become the source of the tragic conclusion. Osman's lack of true sympathy with Zara highlights the real consequences of sympathetic exchange: Hill's quest to restore tragedy to the English stage becomes not only an aesthetic necessity but a moral one. This threat of violence becomes even more potent as audiences negotiated their relationship to the East: if sympathetic exchange were blocked, it would turn the Oriental from a potential ally to an antagonist.

In short, the play's depiction of sympathy complicates its depiction of empire. As Daniel O'Quinn has noted, for Zara Osman is a legitimate choice, and the tragedy happens not because she chooses to remain with the Sultan in captivity, but because he misunderstands her romantic loyalties.[67] The Sultan's tears make the Eastern subject an object of sympathy, but they do so through a conscious evocation of distance in addition to identification. Interestingly, this point of tension was removed in later performances of the play, after Cibber's death. In David Garrick's adaptation of Hill's *Zara*, Osman becomes more clearly a villain. The tragedy is no longer Zara's conflict between legitimate yet incompatible loyalties, but rather focuses on the danger of Eastern violence. The fluid depiction of the nation in Hill's *Zara* creates an intercultural tragic subject, one in which the sultan's tears are as sympathetic as those of the Christian slaves.

Both Osman and Zara's attempted negotiations of their various identities draw attention to the fact that these categories are performative rather than innate: "Zara is simultaneously captive, daughter, sister, friend, Christian, and Muslim, but when she is to be transformed into 'wife' all of these categories come into irresolvable conflict. She quite literally becomes the impossible accommodation of mutually distinct identities: identities that must remain separate for the other

[67] Daniel O'Quinn, "Theatre, Islam, and the Question of Monarchy," in *The Oxford Handbook of Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, ed. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2014), 643.

characters to retain their cultural and social position. Thus the tragedy's sacrifice of Zara clearly demarcates the cost of maintaining identity categories in a cosmopolitan world."[68] The performance of this struggle mimics the spectators' sympathy, which is heightened by an awareness of the constructed nature of the performance. Osman's otherness does not preclude the legitimacy of the alternative he presents. He is not, however, an object of sympathy just because he is rendered familiar, but rather because the rest of the characters are othered, shown as the theatrical creations they are. While *The Tragedy of Zara* speaks to the very modern conflict of negotiating a world with competing values, it presents that negotiation within a context where the relationship between the Orient and Europe is unstable and unpredictable. That instability is not just political, but also reflects the instability of human bodies themselves. If we cannot easily and predictably control our own body's responses in the theater, what does that mean for a time when contact with strangers is expanding? Empire becomes a much more personal project if the impact can reach as far as the body itself.

Voltaire's Fanatic and Miller's Imposter

Much like *Zara*, *Mahomet the Imposter* is a play about the conflict between religious and family loyalty and the overlap between them. Voltaire's *Le fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète* premiered in Lille in 1741. In London, the English *Mahomet the Imposter* was first performed in England at Drury Lane in 1744, adapted/translated by James Miller (who died three days after the first performance) and completed by John Hoadly.[69] Never as popular as *The Tragedy of Zara*, Garrick made revisions to

[68] O'Quinn, "Theatre, Islam, and the Question of Monarchy," 643.

[69] In contemporary accounts of *Zara* and *Mahomet the Imposter*, Voltaire is referenced as the sole author even when the performed text is Hill or Miller's adaptation.

Mahomet for the 1765 production, the first time it had been performed since 1749.[70] *Mahomet* centers on Muhammad's siege of Mecca in 629 AD.[71] Mahomet and the fictional Alcanor (Zopire in the French) have called a brief truce to discuss the terms of war. In conversation with his second in command Pharon (Phanor) Alcanor reveals that he is loves rational belief and free will, and is fighting against Mahomet's fanaticism. In another scene, Mahomet reveals to his second Mirvan (Omar) that fifteen years earlier he abducted and enslaved Alcanor's children Zaphna (Seïde) and Palmira. Zaphna and Palmira have fallen in love, unaware of their familial relationship. Palmira is now the object of Mahomet's lust and jealousy, and Mahomet indoctrinates Zaphna in his religious fanaticism, sending him on a suicide mission to kill Alcanor in Mecca. While Zaphna struggles with this because he respects Alcanor, he ultimately kills him out of loyalty to Mahomet and love for Palmira. Pharon tries to stop the patricide too late, but tells Palmira and Zaphna the truth of their birth before Alcanor dies. Mirvan orders Zaphna's death for the murder of Alcanor, despite knowing that it was carried out under Mahomet's orders. Rather than fall victim to Mahomet's lust, Palmira renounces his religion and suicides.

One of the subtle but potent changes to the play between the French and the English versions is the text's overall approach to religion. The French title of the play is *Le fanatisme, ou Mahomet le Prophète* ("Fanaticism, or Mahomet the Prophet"). Voltaire's title puts the focus on religious zealotry first, and then on Mahomet the individual (with a fairly neutral title). The play was controversial at its premiere; the Turkish ambassador understandably protested, but Church leaders also read it as a veiled attack on Christianity. In part to protect the production of the play, the notorious deist Voltaire dedicated the play to Pope Benedict XIV, who loved it and awarded Voltaire

[70] 25 Nov 1765, *The London Stage*, 1139.
[71] In order to distinguish between the fictional characters and the religious and historical figure, I will use Mahomet when discussing the former and Muhammad when referencing the latter.

with an apostolic benediction and two gold medals.[72] In Voltaire's own description, Mahomet is Tartuffe, Molière's religious hypocrite.[73] Voltaire's tragedy is not just a critique on Islam in particular, but on religious fanaticism and the manipulations of organized religion more broadly.[74] Zaphna and Palmira become murderously devout; that they can be driven to (unknowingly) murder their own father suggests that they do not inherit his more moderate faith. Individual faith is governed by a larger social context rather than the result of divine revelation, a radical suggestion in a country where that social context is dominated by the Catholic Church.

The stakes of the play then reside less with the relative (de)merits of Islam as embodied by Mahomet, but with the next generation's learned fanaticism. While current scholarly interest and public controversy has centered on the portrayal of Mahomet,[75] the dramatic interest in the eighteenth century centered on Zaphna and Palmira. At the premiere in 1744, Garrick played Zaphna, not Mahomet or Alcanor, and, as previously mentioned, the benefit performances of *Mahomet the Imposter* were for the actresses playing the role of Palmira.[76] In his *Theory of Moral*

---

[72] Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre*, 56.

[73] Carlson, *Voltaire and the Theatre*, 54.

[74] Humberto Garcia sees Voltaire's Mahomet as characteristic of anti-Islamic depictions of Muhammad in the eighteenth century that he argues have been overread by scholars at the expense of Islamic Republicanism favored by antimonarchical thinkers of the late eighteenth century; see Humberto Garcia, *Islam and the English Enlightenment, 1670-1840* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2011). Unlike in *The Merchant of Venice*, however, the lead male role was not the non-Christian villain Mahomet but Zaphna, the tragic Muslim hero. I argue that this intra-Muslim tragedy has a more complicated relationship to non-Christian religion than Garcia's dismissal suggests.

[75] French director Herve Loichemol organized a staged reading of the play in Saint-Genis-Pouilly, France in 2006. It was protested by activists representing local Muslim associations, but turned into a small riot when the mayor called in police reinforcements. See Andrew Higgins, "Blame it on Voltaire: Muslims Ask French to Cancel 1741 Play; Alpine Village Riles Activists by Letting Show Go on; Calling on the Riot Police," Wall Street Journal, Mar 06, 2006, Eastern edition. https://search.proquest.com/docview/399063463?accountid=14512.

[76] Scholars writing on Western depictions of Muhammad often misidentify Mahomet as the tragic protagonist because he is the title character, which is insufficient proof to support that claim; beyond the many counterexamples that can be found of title characters who are not protagonists, this argument does not consider how the characterization of Mahomet is incompatible with the *bienséance* of eighteenth-century French theatrical conventions. See Minou Reeves, *Muhammad in Europe* (Reading: Garnet, 2000); Ahmad Gunny, *The Prophet Muhammad in French and English Literature, 1650 to the Present* (Markfield, UK: The Islamic Foundation, 2010); and

Sentiments, Smith uses the audience's sympathy for the plight of Seïde and Palmira in Voltaire's *Mahomet* to describe how we should sympathize with the plight of those led astray by (what he sees as false) religion:[77]

> In the tragedy of Mahomet, one of the finest of Mr. Voltaire's, it is well represented, what ought to be our sentiments for crimes which proceed from such motives. In that tragedy, two young people of different sexes, of the most innocent and virtuous dispositions, and without any other weakness except what endears them the more to us, a mutual fondness for one another, are instigated by the strongest motives of a false religion, to commit a horrid murder, that shocks all the principles of human nature…While they are about executing this crime, they are tortured with all the agonies which can arise from the struggle between the idea of the indispensableness of religious duty on the one side, and compassion, gratitude, reverence for the age, and love for the humanity and virtue of the person whom they are going to destroy, on the other. The representation of this exhibits one of the most interesting, and perhaps the most instructive spectacle that was ever introduced upon any theatre. The sense of duty, however, at last prevails over all the amiable weaknesses of human nature. They execute the crime imposed upon them; but immediately discover their error, and the fraud which had deceived them, and are distracted with horror, remorse, and resentment. Such as are our sentiments for the unhappy Seid and Palmira, such ought we to feel for every person who is in this manner misled by religion, when we are sure that it is

---

Paul T. Levin, *Turkey and the European Union: Christian and Secular Images of Islam* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011).

[77] There is no record of a public performance of Voltaire's text in London. Smith uses Voltaire's name of Seïde rather than Miller's Zaphna, and his description of their relationship is a literary reading rather than an interpretation of a specific performance. Smith did visit Voltaire at Ferney in 1765, after the publication of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. For more on Smith's relationship to French theater, see Deidre Dawson, "Is Sympathy so Surprising? Adam Smith and French Fictions of Sympathy," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 15, no. 1 (1991): 147-61.

> really religion which misleads him, and not the pretence of it, which is made a cover to some of the worst of human passions.[78]

What makes the play tragic then, is not about one emotional feeling being more highly valued than another, but rather the triumph of reason over the emotions. It is the "sense of duty," and so a reasonable action, that drives Seïde to murder Zopire. Misguided reason can be as dangerous as misguided passion. The audience is "endeared" to Palmira and Seïde because their emotions are correct while their reasoning is not, and when it is corrected at the end they go through the appropriate emotional response to unjust killing. This reading of *Mahomet* creates a space for religious tolerance for Smith; Voltaire's play demonstrates that improper actions can be a result of proper feeling, making it possible to sympathize with the religious Other. Voltaire's tragedy dramatizes an Enlightenment pluralism, particularly striking in a play with exclusively Muslim characters.

On the English stage, however, the general critique of fanaticism is muted, shutting off the possibilities for pluralistic reading as demonstrated by Smith. Miller's adaptation minimizes Voltaire's critique of Christianity. The full English title is *Mahomet the Imposter, A Tragedy*; the central conflict is not Mahomet's fanaticism, but that he is a prophet for a non-Christian faith, and he is an imposter (presumably for Christ). As such, it is often not what he says that is problematic but the fact that it is he who is saying it:

> Mah. Dost thou not know, superb, yet feeble Man!
> That the low Insect lurking in the Grass,
> And the Imperial Eagle which aloft
> Ploughs the etherial Plain, are both alike
> In the eternal Eye—Mortals are equal.

[78] Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 177.

It is not Birth, Magnificence, or Pow'r,

But Virtue only makes the Diff'rence 'twixt them.

Alc. [Apart.] What sacred Truth, from what polluted Lips! (II.ii)

Mahomet's speech speaks to a very contemporary idea of civic virtue, that personal virtue does not discriminate by birth or station. The tragedy is in part that his message is so seductive; it is completely understandable that our hero and heroine would mistakenly follow this man who uses religion to serve his pleasures, since his preaching is not alarmingly wrong. Part of the threat of religious fanaticism is how easily the emotions can be carried beyond the control of reason. While religion is one of many competing concerns in Zaïre, along with romance, the nation, and familial bonds, religion is the primary stakes for most of the play as the family connections are not revealed until the end. While family and romantic love have predictable emotional declarations. *Mahomet the Imposter* is interested in not just the fact that religion evokes emotion, but in the meta concern about which emotions it evokes and to what extent.[79]

Mahomet the Imposter shifts the focus of the critique from all religions to Islam in particular, and in doing so creates a dramatic problem. Unlike *Zara*, where the conflict is between Christianity and Islam, *Mahomet the Imposter* dramatizes an intra-Islamic struggle, and so the righteous Alcanor cannot express the principles of true Christian religion. Miller adds a passage to Voltaire's text, where Mirvan briefly suggests that Alcanor is a "closeted" Christian:

Mir. Thou art turn'd Christian, sure! Some straggling Monk

Has taught thee these tame Lessons—

[79] This thematic concern became literal when Thomas Sheridan, Richard Brinsley Sheridan's father, was famously driven out of Ireland when his Smock Alley Theatre in Dublin was destroyed in a political riot started during a performance of *Mahomet the Imposter*. For more on the Smock Alley Riots, see Esther K. Sheldon, *Thomas Sheridan of Smock-Alley* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1967); Helen M. Burke, *Riotous Performances: The Struggle for Hegemony in the Irish Theatre, 1712-1784* (Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2003); Chris Mounsey, "Thomas Sheridan and the Second Smock Alley Theatre Riot, 1754," *New Hibernia Review / Iris Éireannach Nua* 4, no. 3 (2000): 65-77; and Sonja Lawrenson, "Frances Sheridan's 'The History of Nourjahad' and the Sultan of Smock-Alley," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland / Iris an dá chultúr* 26 (2011): 24-50.

Alc. If the Christians

Hold Principles like these, which Reason dictates,

Which all our Notions of the Pow'rs divine

Declare the social Laws they meant for Man,

And all the Beauties and Delights of Nature

Bear Witness to, the Christians may be right:

Thy Sect cannot, who, nurs'd in Blood and Slaughter,

Worship a cruel and revengeful Being,

And draw him always with his Thunder round him,

As ripe for the Destruction of Mankind. (I.i)

Alcanor's religion is described as an eighteenth-century Anglican ideal: true religion is reinforced by, not contradictory to, reason, secular law, and the natural world. Because religious zealotry in and of itself cannot then be Mahomet's flaw, it is his self-proclaimed "Glorious Hypocrisy" that makes him a villain: a mortal claiming divine knowledge he does not possess (II.ii). The anti-Islamic rhetoric of the play is evocative of the more familiar English anti-Catholic rhetoric. Mahomet the Prophet appears to be like a Catholic priest; he wants his acolytes to accept presubscribed interpretations rather than use their reason as the source of their spiritual belief: "How could thy Breast, without the keenest Sting, / Harbour one Thought not dictated by me? / Is that young Mind, I took such Toil to form, / Turn'd an Ingrate and Infidel at once?" (III.i) Palmira's mistaken devotion to Mahomet is understood as the devotion to priests; her religious devotion is dictated by Mahomet's instruction rather than her individual interpretation of faith, guided by reason. Her naming of Mahomet as "Heav'n's Interpreter" suggests the mediation between God and humans that Protestantism resists (I.i).

Mahomet the Imposter is a tragedy because Zaphna and especially Palmira, much like the heroine of Zara, are caught in a struggle between family, state, and religion. In Zara the conflict divides between Christianity and family on one side, religion and state on the other; a conflict, as argued earlier, between equally compelling loyalties which cannot be resolved without tragedy. In Mahomet, the balances are uneven. Alcanor represents true family, the true state, and the true religion. Mahomet has "imposed" on these loyalties, and has falsely claimed them from Palmira and Zaphna:

> *Pal.* Can I be yours when not my own? Your Bounties
> Demand and share my Gratitude. —But Mahomet
> Claims Right o'er me of Parent, Prince, and Prophet.
> Alc. Of Parent, Prince, and Prophet! Heav'ns! That Robber
> Who, a 'scap'd Felon, emulates a Throne,
> And, Scoffer at all Faiths, proclaims a new One! (I.ii)

Family, state, and religion are alliterated and repeated, as Palmira and Alcanor negotiate her contested position in this schema, because in this play they are essentially the same: Palmira's loyalties on all fronts belong with Alcanor. Only explicitly decrying Mahomet's political and religious usurpation, Palmira tragically does not recognize what the formal unity requires: that Mahomet has also usurped Alcanor's parental rights. Zaphna and Palmira learn they are the children of Alcanor, kidnapped and raised by Mahomet, only after stabbing Alcanor. While Zara's paternity discovery comes at the play's climax, *Mahomet the Imposter*'s revelation only comes at the end, when tragedy is unavoidable. Mahomet's triple usurpation threatens Palmira with the possibility of incest and results in patricide and suicide. But it is in suicide that Palmira avoids the disgrace of rape, while also taking control of the narrative: "But I can read thy Thoughts; / *Palmira*'s fav'd for something worse than Death, / That Modesty denies her Tongue to utter. / This to prevent—*Zaphna*, I follow thee. [*Stabs herself with* Zaphna*'s sword.*]" (V.i). Palmira's ability to read Mahomet's face allows her to act, and then

verbally describes what is simultaneously being performed by Mahomet. She no longer needs an interpreter; she can read her fate and act upon it herself.

This distrust of "Heav'n's Interpreter" also suggests a distrust of the process of adaptation itself (I.i). If the danger of religious mediation means that the divine message can be distorted, what does that mean for plays that are adapted? Mediated religion is dangerous because if the mediator is an imposter, then the religious message is perverted. Of course, mediation is impossible to avoid, both in religion and cross-cultural literature. Individual religious devotion is dependent on printers and translators, just as is a play based on a French source. *Mahomet* offers ultimately a more ambivalent relationship to literary cosmopolitanism than the nationalistic prologue discussed earlier would suggest.

The spectator's judgment is based in how the playwright creates the conditions for sympathy, or the exchange of emotion. In Adam Smith's well-known passage about sympathetic identification from the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, he argues that we feel another's emotions through active identification: "By the imagination we place ourselves in his situation, we conceive ourselves enduring all the same torments, we enter as it were into his body, and become in some measure the same person with him, and thence form some idea of his sensations, and even feel something which, though weaker in degree, is not altogether unlike them."[80] This passage is taken up by Montagu, in her description of Shakespeare's ability to animate the emotions of his characters: "Shakespear seems to have had the art of the Dervise, in the Arabian Tales, who could throw his soul into the body of another man, and be at once possessed of his sentiments, adopt his passions, and rise to all the functions and feelings of his situation."[81] Montagu attributes to Shakespeare a greater sympathetic capacity than the French tragedians, whom she sees as being more interested in

[80] Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, 4.
[81] Montagu, *Essay on Shakespear*, 37.

formal imitation than the expression of feeling. But even as Shakespeare's sympathy makes him profoundly English, it also Orientalizes him; he has the powers described in Oriental tales of not just imagining himself in the situations of others, but of physically entering their bodies and co-opting their sentiments and passions. The figure of the dervish, and the Orient more generally, paradoxically gives Montagu a vocabulary for describing a specifically English artistic legitimacy outside of France's cultural authority. Yet this French and English artistic competition also anticipates the more troubling colonial competition that was taking part in the Caribbean at the time, and would expand to include the very Oriental subjects aestheticized here as France and Britain turned to North Africa, the Middle East, and the declining Ottoman Empire.

Montagu's triangulation of Shakespeare, Voltaire, and a nameless Oriental figure exemplify the messiness of true cosmopolitanism. Zaïre, Mahomet, and even the later Sémiramis show the influence of English drama on Voltaire, despite his defense of the French neoclassical tradition, and are then translated into English and made to further conform to the conventions of English tragedy as defined by Shakespeare, all the while set in locations made familiar through the popularity of Oriental tales (many of which, again, were filtered through French) but also through Britain's growing contact with the non-European world as a rising superpower. In defining the aesthetics of a uniquely English tragedy, Montagu extended these attributes to the British national character: original, free, and affectively powerful. Yet this means national tragedy is measured in the production of sympathy, a porous process characterized by boundary crossings like adaptation itself. English tragedy, and so in extension English identity, is defined as much as by what it incorporates from the global world as it is by homegrown conditions.

Chapter Three

Heads and Maidenheads: Adaptations of Scheherazade and Sexual Violence

The opening of *Alf layla wa layla*, translated into French by Antoine Galland as *Les mille et une nuits* (1704-1717) and published in English as the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, is familiar: the sultan, enraged and humiliated by the infidelity of his queen, vows to marry a new woman each evening and have her executed the next day, thereby ensuring the chastity of his marriage bed. His vizier, who both finds each new wife and orders her execution, has a beautiful and intelligent daughter Scheherazade, who volunteers herself as the sultan's next wife. Every night, she tells the sultan a story, but the dawn of each day interrupts her story's end, and so each day her execution is put off, until after hundreds of nights and stories the sultan grants her life, having found a worthy queen.

But the digressive nature of the *Nights* starts before Scheherazade embarks on her bravura performance, in a less-familiar interpolated tale. The sultan Schahriar and his brother Schahzenan have both discovered their wives' infidelity, to their humiliation. While hunting in order to forget their sorrows, they come upon a genie who has imprisoned a beautiful lady in a locked box. As the genie sleeps, she beckons the men down from their hiding place in a tree, threatening to wake the genie if they do not have sex with her. Afterwards, she takes a ring from each, adding to her large collection of tokens from lovers:

> So that, continues she, I have had an hundred gallants already, notwithstanding the vigilance of this wicked genie, that never leaves me. He is much the nearer for locking me up in this glass box, and hiding me in the bottom of the sea; I find a way to cheat him for all his care. You may see by this, that when a woman has formed a project, there is no husband or gallant that can hinder her putting it in execution. Men had better not put their wives under such restraint, if they have a mind they should be chaste. —Having spoke thus to them, she put

their rings upon the same string with the rest, and sitting her down by the monster, as before, laid his head again upon her lap, and made a sign for the princes to be gone.[1]

The brothers take from this encounter the belief that women are incapable of fidelity and chastity, since even a genie's prison cannot keep his mistress faithful, but the genie's mistress's actions are in part spurred on by this captivity, a type of resistance that anticipates Scheherazade's more chaste rebellion against state violence. While not disrupting the hierarchy that men control their wives, the genie's lady speaks the corollary: if men are rulers, then they must practice good governance. The lady's defense, that imprisonment will not ensure women's chastity and obedience, echoes Matthew Prior's 1705 poem "An English Padlock" (published the same year that the *Nights* began appearing in English) which proclaims, "Tell us, mistaken Husband, tell us, / Why so Mysterious, why so Jealous? / Does the Restraint, the Bolt, the Bar, / Make us less Curious, her less Fair?…Let all her Ways be unconfin'd, / And clap your PADLOCK on her Mind."[2] If, as Locke writes, "so far as a man has a power to think, or not to think; to move, or not to move, according to the preference or direction of his own mind, so far is a man *free*,"[3] both the *Nights* and "An English Padlock" argue that a woman's freedom is controlled by her own mind and not by any restrictions placed upon her by an outside force. And as the story of Schahriar and Scheherazade shows, if the mind is where fidelity will be determined, then heads must roll.

The appearance of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* ignited an explosion of drama and prose set in the Orient, but as I have shown, it was building upon an already popular genre, the Oriental tragedy. Female pathos in tragedy is most often centered on conflicts in romantic love. Sexual

---

[1] Robert L. Mack, ed., *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995; reissued 2009), 8-9. All subsequent references are to this edition, cited in the text.

[2] Matthew Prior, "An English Padlock" (London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1705), 1-2, Eighteenth-Century Collections Online.

[3] John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Kenneth P. Winkler (1689, this edition Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Co., 1996), 95.

violence and rape are often the instigators for female pathos, playing on fears regarding women's physical vulnerability while also sexualizing the spectacle of the defiled female body.[4] In both these texts and in English legal code, women are particularly vulnerable to both unlawful assault and also to violence condoned by religion and the state. The frame tale of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* provides a particularly fruitful space for these explorations. The exoticism of the setting and characters (a sultan in the Orient) paradoxically renders the violence found in and around marriage quotidian, aligning with the violence and control also found in eighteenth-century European marriages.

This chapter will look at three adaptations of the frame tale of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, the anonymous "Grub Street" English translation published in installments between 1706 and 1721.[5] These texts adapt the *Nights* across genres: tragedy and musical comedy on the

[4] For more on this trope and the generic conventions of Restoration Oriental tragedy and she-tragedy, see Chapter One.

[5] The *Arabian Nights* is a notoriously unstable text. The tales derive from mid-eighth-century Baghdad, ninth-century Persia, and twelfth to fourteenth-century Cairo. Muhsin Mahdi has argued that the oldest extant Arabic text of the *Nights* is the fourteenth-century Syrian manuscript that Galland used as the basis for his translation, now held in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. Robert Irwin also cites Hanna Diab as a source, a Maronite Christian Arab who orally dictated fourteen additional stories, seven of which entered Galland's text. The *Nights* is, in Felicity Nussbaum's term, a "linguistic palimpsest" with passages of Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and Greek. See Ferial J. Ghazoul, *Nocturnal Poetics: The Arabian Nights in Comparative Context* (Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 1996), 1-16; Heinz Grotzfeld, "Creativity, Random Selection, and *pia fraus:* Observations on Compilation and Transmission of the *Arabian Nights*," in *The Arabian Nights in Transnational Perspective*, ed. Ulrich Marzolph (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2007), 51-63; Saree Makdisi and Felicity Nussbaum, introduction to *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 1-5, 13-15; Felicity A. Nussbaum, "Slavery, Blackness, and Islam: *The Arabian Nights* in the Eighteenth Century," in *Slavery and the Cultures of Abolition: Essays Marking the Bicentennial of the British Abolition Act of 1807*, eds. Brycchan Carey and Peter Kitson (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007), 150-72. Galland's translation was published in installments in the course of thirteen years, and an anonymous English translation began in 1706 (known as the "Grub Street" translation). For more on Galland's translation and its Grub Street translation, see Srinivas Aravamudan, "The Adventure Chronotope and the Oriental Xenotrope: Galland, Sheridan, and Joyce Domesticate *The Arabian Nights*," in *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*, 235-63; Ros Ballaster, "Eighteenth-Century English Translations of *The Thousand and One Nights* and the Lure of Elemental Difference," in *Scheherazade's Children: Global Encounters with the Arabian Nights*, ed. Philip F. Kennedy and Marina Warner (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 27-52; Madeleine Dobie, "Translation in the Contact Zone: Antoine Galland's *Mille et une nuits: contes arabes*," in *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*, 25-49; Robert Irwin, *The Arabian Nights: A Companion* (New York: Tauris Parke, 1994), 14-20; Rebecca Carol Johnson, Richard Maxwell, and Katie Trumpener, "The *Arabian Nights*, Arab-European Literary Influence, and the Lineages of the Novel," *Modern Language Quarterly* 68, no. 2 (2007): 243-80; C. Knipp, "The 'Arabian Nights' in England: Galland's Translation and its Successors," *Journal of Arabic Literature* 5

stage, and amatory fiction. I will start by considering Galland's translation of the *Arabian Nights* in English, itself an adaptation of *Alf layla wa layla*. I will then move to Delarivier Manley's tragedy *Almyna; or, The Arabian Vow* (1706), arguably the first adaptation of the *Nights* post-Galland, followed by George Colman the Younger's often-performed afterpiece *Blue-beard; or Female Curiosity!* (1798), which mixes a popular French tale about violence against women with the Scheherazade story. I will finish with Eliza Haywood's *The Padlock; or, No Guard without Virtue* (1728) a prose text written at the height of her theatrical career, directly adapting a Cervantes' *The Jealous Husband* (1613) (which had a greater afterlife on the English stage than as prose through Charles Dibdin's *The Padlock* [1768]) but which also draws on the *Nights*' frame tale in its depiction of male sexual violence. I argue that the Orientalist adaptations of the *Nights* and of European folktales provide an imaginary space that depict the sexual violence as not incidental to marriage but intrinsic. Manley and Colman explore resistance to sexual violence, but only Haywood is able to envision a form of companionate marriage (albeit a radical second marriage after divorce) that incorporates (rather than punishes), female sexuality.

These texts are important in aggregate, illuminating how the padlock functions as a symbol of patriarchal control and misogynist terror. The issue of the padlock, even when used to argue for women's agency, collapses the distance between women's chastity (and with that sexual invasion) and the mind. The *Nights* and other "padlock" texts explore the relationship between women's political

(1974): 44-54; Sylvette Larzul, "Further Considerations on Galland's *Mille et une Nuits*: A Study of the Tales Told by Hannâ," in *The Arabian Nights in Transnational Perspective*, ed. Ulrich Marzolph (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2007), 17-31; Duncan B. MacDonald, "A Biographical and Literary Study of the First Appearance of the 'Arabian Nights' in Europe," *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 2, no. 4 (1932): 387-420; Robert L. Mack, "Cultivating the Garden: Antoine Galland's *Arabian Nights* in the Traditions of English Literature," in *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*, 51-81; Sheila Shaw, "Early English Editions of the *Arabian Nights*: Their Value to Eighteenth-Century Literary Scholarship," *Muslim World* 49 (1959): 232-38. All English editions of the *Nights* were translated and edited from Galland's French translation until Edward Lane's English translation from the original Arabic, appearing in installments in 1838-41. See Marina Warner, *Stranger Magic: Charmed States and the Arabian Nights* ((Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2013), 165; Robert Irwin, *The Arabian Nights: A Companion* (New York: Tauris Parke, 1994), 23-25.

agency and their sexual agency, embodying the threat of violence from the state as the threat to women's bodies from husbands. Looking at these as adaptations clarifies the stakes and limitations of how each text conceptualizes state institutionalized violence against women. As Prior's title "An English Padlock" suggests in domesticating the padlock, English women's freedoms were favorably contrasted with the spatial constraints of the convent in the Catholic South and of the harem in the Ottoman Empire. Yet England's common law doctrine of coverture, which maintained that "a husband's legal identity covered that of the woman he married"[6] and so giving married women no legal personhood, actually made English women among the most legally restricted in Europe. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's *Turkish Embassy Letters* (written 1717-1718, published 1763) use the harem and the veil to compare the different physical and legal restraints placed on women in England and the Ottoman Empire, and not necessarily to England's benefit.[7] These texts explore the questions of sovereignty that are the focus of Restoration Oriental tragedy, focusing on how women's bodies and sexuality become the engine of female oppression by men.

Narrative and Marital Violence in the Arabian Nights

Though framed as a glimpse into the sexual culture of the Orient for European readers, the exotic setting of the frame tale of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* creates a space to interrogate Anglo-French concerns about authority, both political and narrative, and its relationship to bodies in confined spaces. The structure of the harem and the gender divisions of which evoke the racial divisions of the plantations in both French and British West Indian colonies exacerbate anxieties

[6] Tim Stretton and Krista J. Kesselring, "Introduction: Coverture and Continuity," in *Married Women and the Law: Coverture in England and the Common Law World*, ed. Tim Stretton and Krista J. Kesselring (Montréal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013), 7.
[7] See Felicity A. Nussbaum, *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 135-49; and Humberto Garcia, *Islam and the English Enlightenment, 1670-1840* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012), 60-92.

about excessive erotic appetite of women and the oversexed black male body. The publication and dissemination of the *Nights* is an expansion of the literary landscape in the same way that the overseas plantations expanded the geographic landscape, but the frame tale and its adaptations emphasize the danger of confined spaces and the precarity of authority.

The frame tale of the *Arabian Nights* shows how private marital betrayal is revenged through state violence, as the sultan revenges his personal hurt through the murder of the female subjects who are forced to share his bed. This betrayal is mitigated by the scene of sexual betrayal, described in lurid detail as the sultan's brother witnesses the sultaness's cuckolding. Schahzenan, the king of Tartary, remains in the palace during his brother Schahriar's hunt to bewail his wife's infidelity only to see a similar scene enacted before him by Schahriar's wife in the garden:

> A secret gate of the sultan's palace opened all of a sudden, and there came out at it twenty women, in the midst of whom marched the sultaness, who was easily distinguished from the rest, by her majestic air. This princess, thinking that the king of Tartary was gone a-hunting with his brother the sultan, came up with her retinue near the windows of his apartment; for the prince had placed himself so, that he could see all that passed in the garden, without being perceived himself. He observed, that the persons who accompanied the sultaness threw off their veils and long robes, that they might be at more freedom; but he was wonderfully surprised when he saw ten of them blacks, and that each of them took his mistress. The sultaness, on her part, was not long without her gallant. She clapped her hands, and called Masoud, Masoud; and immediately a black came down from a tree, and ran to her in all haste.
>
> Modesty will not allow, nor is it necessary, to relate what passed betwixt the blacks and the ladies. It is sufficient to say, that Schahzenan saw enough to convince him, that his brother had as much cause to complain as himself. This amorous company continued

> together till midnight, and having bathed together in a great pond, which was one of the chief ornaments of the garden, they dressed themselves, and re-entered the palace by the secret door, all except Masoud, who climbed up his tree, and got over the garden-wall the same way as he came. (*Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, 4)

The robes and veils worn by Eastern women completely hide the black servants, who are then able to penetrate both the spaces (like the garden) and the bodies of royalty undetected. The single-sex space of the harem and Muslim conventions of the veil then serve to invite the penetration of men rather than prevent it: veils hide the body of both men and women, and the nature of the harem means that it cannot be extensively policed by male authority. In fact, the space itself is violated as the brother's window is the very location where the assignations take place. Despite focusing on a specific scene of objectification, the narrative turns one women's behavior into a general misogynist claim, later reinforced later by the genie's mistress: women will all act the same way when away from the eyes of men.

While patriarchal violence was very real, both in the medieval Middle East and in eighteenth-century Europe, the culpability for that violence is displaced onto groups with little political agency: women and enslaved black men. The assumption is that only one thing can possibly occur when Eastern women and black men are together in the same space, which the text imbues with an affective revulsion. The sultaness's lover Masoud is named, but he is characterized as a pet monkey, in what would become a racist trope, climbing up and down the tree at his mistress's bidding. The pleasure of abjection is also what makes the sultaness's transgression so terrible. While all the other black men enter the garden in disguise, the sexual partner that the sultaness prefers to the king seems animal-like, coming down from the tree on command and scurrying back at the conclusion; sex between queen and servant is enjoyed as if between two species, biologically as well as politically non-generative.

The sexual encounter between the women of the harem and the enslaved black men would have been particularly resonant to Europeans in the eighteenth century, with both British and French plantation colonies well-established in the Caribbean. The scene in the garden displaces onto the East anxieties about race and gender that were being enacted in the Caribbean at the time, highlighting the impact of the growing colonial empires of both France and Britain in the West Indies on the European imagination. While the story was not invented in the eighteenth-century translation, the anxieties it evokes speak more specifically to contemporary chattel slavery than to the slavery of the medieval Middle East, which took various different forms not predominately based on race. The story of the sultaness's infidelity plays on French and English fears of plantation rebellion in the early eighteenth-century Caribbean and North American colonies: the real threat comes not from outside invasion by other European powers, but from inside the home.[8] The description of Masoud as "a black" ("un noir" in Galland) applies more directly to the European colonies' use of African chattel slavery than slavery in the Middle East and North Africa;[9] the Ottoman Empire, for example, included enslaved people from Central Asia, Eastern Europe, and Central Africa, and the Sudan.[10] As the *Nights* presented itself as a guide to the "Customs and Manners of the Eastern Nations,"[11] this depiction of slavery deflects attention to the similarities of

[8] The first slave revolt in the British colonies would happen only a few years later in New York in 1712.

[9] Bernard Lewis, *Race and Slavery in the Middle East: An Historical Enquiry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 11-13.

[10] Ehud R. Toledano, *Slavery and Abolition in the Ottoman Middle East* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 7.

[11] Antoine Galland, preface to *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, in *In Praise of Fiction: Prefaces to Romances and Novels, 1650-1760*, ed. Baudouin Millet (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 210.

this episode to the contemporary European slave practice towards the imagined difference with the historical and contemporary Orient.[12]

Not only is the moral question around slavery displaced onto another culture, but the problem of miscegenation is inverted, moving the blame in a way that maintains patriarchal authority. The anxieties around miscegenation are dramatized through the sultaness's infidelity, which means that her potential children could either be the sultan's or this black slave's. Yet in the eighteenth-century Americas, it is white sexual violence against black women that produced mixed-race children, muddying delineations between the white enslavers, enslaved and free blacks, and the indigenous population. In the early eighteenth century, patrimony is contentious in the colonies, where free and enslaved half-siblings coexisted on plantations, but also back at the metropole where Britain and France were both experiencing monarchies with unstable lines of succession.[13] Colonial fears focus on black men attacking white women (or here, on white women's abject desires),[14] and this would become a familiar racist trope, justifying black slavery and the terror of white supremacist violence. The narrative inverts blame from the most common cause of miscegenation: the concubinage and rape of black women by their white male enslavers.[15] That the sultaness cuckolds Schahriar in gardens of the palace, undermining the protected single-sex environment of the harem, evokes the

[12] For more on eighteenth-century discourse on the Orient and slavery, see Ashley L. Cohen, "Wage Slavery, Oriental Despotism, and Global Labor Management in Maria Edgeworth's Popular Tales," *The Eighteenth Century* 55, no. 2-3 (2014): 193-215.

[13] The ruling monarchs of Britain and France when the *Nights* began its publication would engender crises of succession. Queen Anne, who succeeded the throne from William and Mary over her deposed Catholic father Janes II, would die childless in 1714, ending the House of Stuart. Anne's German second cousin became the first Hanover king, George I, weathering the first Jacobite attempt at restoring the Stuart succession. In absolutist France, the Sun King Louis XIV's last surviving son died in 1711 followed a year later by his eldest grandson and great-grandson. When he died in 1715, Louis XIV was succeeded by his five-year-old great-grandson.

[14] Khalid Bekkaoui traces the depiction of white women's vulnerability to Oriental virility in eighteenth-century novels and plays; see Khalid Bekkaoui, "White Women and Moorish Fancy in Eighteenth-Century Literature," in *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*, 153-66.

[15] Colleen A. Vasconcellos, *Slavery, Childhood, and Abolition in Jamaica, 1788-1838* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2015), 39-59.

later anxieties in the Caribbean, where plantation rebellion was feared far more than invasion by another European power (the real threat is coming from inside the house). Importantly, this narrative shows how the weapons of white supremacy are inextricable from anxieties around female sexuality, ones that purposefully blur the lines between consensual deviant sexual behavior and coercion and assault.

In the frame tale, women's active sexuality necessitates state-sanctioned marital violence. The response of the brother kings to betrayal collapses their duties as husbands and rulers, normalizing the brutality of their responses. Schahzenan rationalizes his actions as such:

> As king, I am to punish wickedness committed in my dominions; and as an enraged husband, I must sacrifice you to my just resentment. In a word, this unfortunate prince, giving way to his rage, drew his scymetar, and approaching the bed, killed them both with one blow, turning their sleep into death; and afterwards taking them up, threw them out of a window into the ditch that surrounded the palace. (*ANE* 2)

Schahzenan actions are not extrajudicial: despite the narration's description of Schahzenan's loss of control of his anger, the murder is linked to his duty as both a king and a husband. The metaphoric death of sleep and *petit mort* of sex become literal death. His brother Schahriar's revenge takes the form of beheading young women in both senses of the word: "In a word, there was every day a maid married, and a wife murdered" (ANE 10). Schahriar's victims become generic surrogates for the position of wife, and so the act of marriage itself becomes a part of the punishment. Marriage to the sultan, what was once an honor, becomes something to fear and dread for the populace. Schahriar's crimes are committed against a group, rather than against women as individuals. The *Nights* itself performs this same generalization as the sultan's marriages become a synecdoche for patriarchy itself: before each woman loses her head, she must also lose her maidenhead.

Scheherazade's resistance to the seeming inevitability of violence then rests on both her narrative and sexual performances: "If I perish, my death will be glorious, and if I succeed, I shall do my country an important piece of service" (*ANE* 11). But individual heroism is not enough: female interpersonal bonds are what stand up to male monomaniacal violence. Dinarzade serves as her "second string": her dueling second and replacement, the adjacent string necessary to make music, and an allusion to the bowstring that serves as the mode of execution in Turkish and Middle Eastern courts.[16] Unlike other translations and editions of the *Nights*, which make the connections between Scheherazade's narrative tension and sexual fulfillment explicit,[17] Galland and the subsequent Grub Street translation minimize the sexual implications of Schariar's vow. As with his description of the seraglio, Galland attempts to remove the logical endpoint of Scheherazade's strategy: a *ménage-à-trois* to save her life. The sleeping arrangements become almost nonsensical in Galland's attempts to neutralize Dinarzade's presence in the bedchamber,[18] describing an arrangement unknown in any cultural context: "The sultan went to bed with Scheherazade upon an alcove raised very high, according to the custom of the east; and Dinarzade lay in a bed that was prepared for her near the foot of the alcove" (*ANE* 17). Unlike other translations and editions of

[16] Ros Ballaster, "Playing the Second String: The Role of Dinarzade in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction," *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*, 86.

[17] Arguably no more so than in Richard Burton's translation. "So when it was night their father the Wazir carried Shahrazad to the King who was gladdened at the sight and asked, 'Hast thou brought me my need?' and he answered, 'I have.' But when the King took her to his bed and fell to toying with her and wished to go in to her she wept; which made him ask, 'What aileth thee?' She replied, 'O King of the age, I have a younger sister and lief would I take leave of her this night before I see the dawn.' So he sent at once for Dunyazad, and she came and kissed the ground between his hands, when he permitted her to take her seat near the foot of the couch. Then the King arose and did away with his bride's maidenhead and the three fell asleep;" *The Arabian Nights: Tales from a Thousand and One Nights*, trans. Richard F. Burton (1885; New York: Random House, 2004), 26. Burton's description of all three (Schahriar, Scheherazade, Dinarzade) falling asleep postcoital even more strongly suggests Dinarzade as a sexual participant.

[18] Warner, *Stranger Magic*, 144-45.

the *Nights*, which make the connections between narrative and sex,[19] Galland's ending also lacks the part where Scheherazade presents the three children she has borne to Schahriar in over the course of the nights and with that the material proof of that sexual intercourse occurred in that aloft bed.[20] The affective tension underlying the frame tale—will Scheherazade live to the next day?—replicates the narrative tension that Dinarzade must perform every dawn:

> I long mightily, says Dinarzade, to know what became of that young prince; I tremble for him. I will deliver you from your uneasiness tomorrow, answers the sultaness, if the sultan will allow me to live till then. Schahriar, willing to hear an end of this adventure, prolonged Scheherazade's life for another day. (*ANE* 42)

Schahriar must be in sympathy with Dinarzade for the plan to work because he must be as excited or intrigued as she is to hear the stories continued in order for Scheherazade's execution to be postponed. Dinarzade's presence points to another, secondary purpose of Scheherazade's storytelling: not only is Scheherazade attempting to educate Schahriar, but this is also a scene of instruction for Dinarzade:[21]

> An hour before day, Dinarzade being awake, failed not to do as her sister ordered her. My dear sister, cries she, if you be not asleep, I pray, until day-break, which will be in a very little time, that you will tell me one of those pleasant stories you have read; alas! this may, perhaps, be the last time that ever I shall have that satisfaction.

---

[19] Sandra Naddaff, *Arabesque: Narrative Structure and the Aesthetics of Repetition in 1001 Nights* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1991), 32.

[20] For more on how the explicitly sexual frame tale was treated in the *Nights*' role in the developing genre of children's literature, see Brian Alderson, "Scheherazade in the Nursery," in *The Arabian Nights in English Literature: Studies in the Reception of The Thousand and One Nights into British Culture*, ed. Peter L. Caracciolo (London: Macmillan Press, 1988), 81-94. For more on the different conclusions in various editions of the *Nights*, see Heinz Grotzfeld, "Neglected Conclusions of the *Arabian Nights*: Gleanings in Forgotten and Overlooked Recensions," *Journal of Arabic Literature* 16 (1985): 73-87.

[21] Jack Zipes, "Afterword" to *Arabian Nights: The Marvels and Wonders of the Thousand and One Nights*, trans. Richard Burton (New York: Signet Classics, 1991), 587-88.

> Scheherazade, instead of answering her sister, addressed herself to the sultan, thus: Sir, will your majesty be pleased to allow me to give my sister this satisfaction? With all my heart, answers the sultan. Then Scheherazade bid her sister listen, and afterwards addressing herself to Schahriar, began thus. (*ANE* 17)

The sleeping arrangements according to Scheherazade's plan replicate the polygamous structure of the harem, which Dinarzade participates in by inciting the desire for narrative satisfaction after the sultan's postcoital satisfaction. Dinarzade upends the truism that no one can know what goes on in a marriage, as the witness to the state violence that cannot be uncoupled from sex between the sultan and his wives.

For Galland, Dinarzade's presence in the text is uncomfortable, for her intrusion into both marital consummation and narrative momentum. The text attempts to delete the later "redundant" passages from the original that call back to the frame tale: after the twenty-seventh night, in an advertisement added in the French and English versions of the *Nights*, the text claims to drop the mentions of the frame tale, focusing on the interpolated tales themselves:

> The readers of these Tales were tired in the former editions, with the interruption Dinarzade gave them: this defect is now remedied; and they will meet with no more interruptions at the end of every night. It is sufficient to know the Arabian author's design, who first made this collection: and for this purpose we retained his method in the preceding nights. There are of these Arabian Tales, where neither Scheherazade, sultan Schahriar, Dinarzade, nor any distinction by nights, is mentioned; which shews that all the Arabians have not approved the method which this author has used, and that a great number of them have been fatigued with these repetitions. This, therefore, being reformed in the following translation, the reader must be acquainted that Scheherazade goes now on always without being interrupted. (*ANE* 65-66)

This tactic moves narrative authority from collaborative, feminine interlocution to the masculine solo creation of the narrator. It also ascribes an affect contradictory to the sentimental tension expressed by the character Dinarzade for each tale's character and by extension for her sister Scheherazade: boredom. Scheherazade's fate is assumed to be of less interest to readers than each individual tale. But the framing device does not disappear completely; the narrative structure (and Galland's own additions) require Dinarzade's continued presence, as her periodic comments incorporate the orphan tales into the larger text. When a story wraps up without continuing on directly to another tale, the storytelling becomes a bravura performance, as Scheherazade must promise to best her own story the next day:

> But, sir, added Scheherazade, observing that day began to appear, though the story I have now told you be very agreeable, I have one still that is much more so. If your majesty pleases to hear it the next night, I am certain you will be of the same mind. Schahriar rose without giving an answer, and was in a quandary what to do….[he said] The story she promises is perhaps more diverting than all she has told yet; I will not deprive myself of the pleasure of hearing it, but when once she has told it, then she shall die. (*ANE* 222)

Scheherazade's *sprezzatura* is what finally saves her from her perpetual death sentence. Dinarzade continually asks for more stories, performing wonder at the seemingly inexhaustible imagination of Scheherazade for Schahriar's benefit. Wonder is the affective antithesis of Schahriar's tyranny, as an emotional reaction to exemplarity. Schahriar's essentialist cruelty is devoid of curiosity, never remaining married to a woman long enough to distinguish her from his other wives, feeling no sympathy towards them. Dinarzade repeatedly performs this feeling of wonder and Schahriar eventually begins to sympathize with her.

What transforms Schahriar is not the content of the individual stories: as many readers have seen, many of the tales do not provide evidence that would help recover a misogynist. Rather, in the

telling of the stories Scheherazade becomes an exemplar, able to be distinguished and rise above other women:

> A thousand and one nights had passed away in these agreeable and innocent amusements; which contributed so much towards removing the sultan's fatal prejudice against all women, and sweetening the violence of his temper, that he conceived a great esteem for the sultaness Scheherazade; and was convinced of her merit and great wisdom, and remembered with what courage she exposed herself voluntarily to be his wife, knowing the fatal destiny of the many sultanesses before her. These considerations, and the many rare qualities he knew her to be mistress of, induced him at last to forgive her. (*ANE* 892)

Her uniqueness means that she cannot be regulated to a general group. Women's humanity cannot be understood until they are prevented from being relegated to a generalized and passive whole. But Scheherazade's exemplarity is its own trap. Her singularity demeans the whole gender, a gender she will never not belong to. Schahriar forgives Scheherazade and Dinarzade's plan, but in a way she is also forgiven for his first wife's infidelity (a generalized forgiveness for a generalized crime). The problem with exemplarity is that exceptions reinforce the rule: Scheherazade's unique heroism ultimately does nothing to disrupt the violence to the person and humanity of women that is endemic to marriage, as enacted at the beginning of the frame tale. While the bedtime ritual is exotic, the threatened loss of person (and actual loss of personhood) is found within the English readership's own borders.

Incomplete Bodies in Delarivier Manley's Almyna

Delarivier Manley's *Almyna, or, The Arabian Vow* (1706, published 1707) fuses the exemplarity of Scheherazade and the wonder she inspires with the emphasis on female pathos in Restoration Oriental tragedy. In her preface, Manley describes *Almyna* as a fable "taken from the Life of that

great Monarch, *Caliph Valid Almanzor*, who Conquer'd *Spain*,[22] with something of a Hint from the *Arabian* Nights Entertainments,"[23] one of the earliest references to the English translation of Galland.[24] The preface shows that in retelling Galland's proto-Orientalist fantasy, Manley reinscribes it with a political and historical specificity[25] that will heighten the stakes for the debate for Almyna's life. In retrospect, *Almyna* debuted when the London stage was in a period of transition: Manley wrote the play after a ten-year absence from the stage, and the play was the last performed by Anne Bracegirdle before her retirement and was also the final pairing of Bracegirdle opposite her frequent co-star, the premiere tragedienne Elizabeth Barry, as Zoradia and Almyna, respectively.[26] The play is similarly a generic lynchpin, as *Almyna* is both the first in a long tradition of English adaptations of the *Nights* but is also, as the only tragic adaptation of the *Nights* in the eighteenth century,[27] continuous with the preceding generic conventions of Restoration tragedy established with *The Siege of Rhodes* (1656, 1661) that centered female pathos. Often elided in critical conversations about the text in relation to other Restoration tragedies, reading *Almyna* within the context of other

[22] It is worth noting that this Orientalist play is set in Europe, albeit in Moorish Spain. But as Ros Ballaster and Bridget Orr have noted, while a Eurocentric critique could be read into Almyna's denunciation of the caliph, the piece would be received as representative of the Ottoman Turks, regardless of the setting. See also Ros Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 85n28.

[23] Delarivier Manley, preface to *Almyna: Or, The Arabian Vow. A Tragedy. As it is Acted at the Theatre Royal in the Hay-Market, by her Majesty's Servants* (London: Printed for William Turner, at the Angel at Lincolns-Inn back-Gate; and Egbert Sanger, at the Post-House at the Middle-Temple Gate in Fleetstreet, 1707). All subsequent citations are in the text.

[24] Su Fang Ng, "Delariviere Manley's *Almyna* and Dating the First Edition of the English *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*," English Language Notes 40, no. 3 (2003): 19-26.

[25] Bridget Orr, *Empire on the English Stage, 1660-1714* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 132.

[26] For more on the Barry/Bracegirdle partnership, see Elizabeth Howe, *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama, 1660-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 156-162.

[27] The publication of the *Nights* would not be complete for another fifteen years, and so *Almyna*'s tragic ending was not yet known to be a deviation from the source material.

adaptations of the *Nights* illuminates the play's investment in female emotion and women's bodies in its staging of logical argumentation.

In *Almyna*, the exploration of gendered violence is centered less on the geographic and narrative boundaries of the frame tale but rather on the composition of gendered bodies. Caliph Almanzor, who like the *Nights*' Schahriar violently hates women after his queen cuckolded him with a slave, has vowed that he will marry a new queen every evening before ordering his Grand Vizier to oversee her execution the following morning. He justifies this both through his experience with infidelity but also because the "Alcoran" says that women have no souls[28], and are thus interchangeable, merely serving the carnal appetites of men. As he explains why the brother should not marry Almyna, Caliph Almanzor directly retells the story of the *Nights* frame tale, as his sultan brother returns to his queen unexpectedly:

> But when at Samarcand he left his Bride,
> (Unsated Love, still glowing in his Breast)
> Returning unexpected back, he found the false,
> The curst Adultress in another's Arms!
> Well did he execute, his instant Veng'ance on 'em,
> And by his Scymiter unite their Fates. (I.i, 10-11)

The brother's unsated lust becomes monstrous when found in his adulterous wife. Lust and desire (both marital and adulterous) are built up Frankenstein-like through combining isolated body parts (the breast, arms). The wife and her lover paradoxically are united with the removal of their individual heads, and with that their separate consciousness. Almanzor suggests, first, that unfaithful

[28] There is no basis for this claim in the Qur'an; see Bernadette Andrea, "Introduction: Delarivier Manley" in *English Women Staging Islam, 1696-1707* (Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2012), 36-37. This was by no means universally accepted by contemporaries: Lady Mary Wortley Montagu corrected this error in her *Turkish Embassy Letters*; see Garcia, *Islam and the English Enlightenment*, 69.

women are incomplete bodies and, second, that women in general are also lacking, functioning but soulless and so are disposable after use, rejecting the immoral but consensual pleasure of the queen and reducing women to objects. While this belief is ascribed to the Alcoran, the misogynist idea that female bodies are inherently lacking substance was a longstanding European theory.[29] Almyna must prove that women possess all the moral and spiritual capacities as men, making them complete individuals, in order to avoid losing her head, being rendered truly incomplete.

This story of infidelity is grotesquely expanded with Almanzor's own wife, who his brother watches commit adultery in the garden of the seraglio. Here, the spatial violations are foregrounded:

> For in the Gardens of the Queen's Seraglio,
> (Which she thought inaccessible to all,
> Not knowing we had privileg'd our Brother)
> He found the Eastern Empress, all undrest,
> Supinely laid, upon a Bed of Flowers,
> Her flowing robes, no longer veild her Charms!
> But all the bright Adultress, stood Confest!
> Enjoying, and enjoy'd, by a vile moorish Slave.
> Mayn't she be vile, and yet Almyna Chast? (I.i, 11)

The *mise-en-scène*, taken directly from the *Nights*, highlights the baseness of adultery: the queen, naked amongst the flowers, having sex with her Moorish slave, eliding of course the play's setting in Moorish Spain in its depiction of racial difference. What should be private is no longer, but not only the queen's naked body but the seraglio itself. Part of the horror is the queen and the slave's mutual enjoyment, and enjoyment that crosses class (and racial) boundaries. The queen's consensual

[29] Felicity A. Nussbaum, "Dumb Virgins, Blind Ladies, and Eunuchs: Fictions of Defect," in *"Defects": Engendering the Modern Body*, ed. Helen Deutsch and Felicity Nussbaum (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 32.

pleasure is a violation of her marriage vows, while the discovery of adultery is predicated on the violation of a space normally only accessible to the sultan.

By focusing the tragic pathos in the subplot with Almyna's sister Zoradia, *Almyna* deprioritizes the sentimental display expected of tragedy without eliminating it. Almyna offers herself as the sultan's next bride, potentially sacrificing her life for the chance to persuade the sultan to end his continuing murders. Like Scheherazade, Almyna refuses sentiment in favor of the desire to embody heroic exemplarity:

> But I to Glory have resign'd my Life,
> That Spiritual Pride of Noble hearts!
> And not to be as Love, Cloy'd with Possession.
> Glory the strongest passion of great Minds!
> Which none but Souls enlarg'd, can entertain
> Uncommon, wonderful, and Excellent!
> Heroick! which Excites; nay, more, Commands!
> Our admiration, Homage, and Applause. (III.i, 27-28)

In what will become crucial in her argument, glory is a passion that needs a larger soul to encompass than the more basic passions like lust. Almyna's success will reinstate women with the potential for singularity, rather than their current classification as an anonymous body for the sultan to derive his victims from him. While *Almyna* can be read as part of the tradition of feminist Islamophobia, her position as a "loquacious harem woman"[30] endows her with political agency and religious authority unavailable to English Anglican women. Singularity is the condition that allows for wonder, as cited here. Scheherazade and Almyna's exemplarity spur their resolve to make what seems like the ultimate sacrifice, and their unparalleled skill with language saves them both.

[30] Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients*, 129.

But in Almyna's soliloquy, the text seems to pull away from fully endowing her with this individual heroism. When alone, she confesses that she is doing this as much for her love for Almanzor as for her desire for glory:

> Oh, Glory! thou whose Vot'ry most I seem,
> And thou, O Love! whose Vot'ry most I am;
> Unite your Rival Pow'rs, and give Success.
> If thus unsought, I yield a Virgin heart,
> Almanzor's noble Form commands excuse.
> His Valour, Birth, his each Heroick Vertue!
> A heart incompass'd round with such Defence,
> Appears a Conquest worthy thy Endeavours.
> Shine out my Stars, auspicious as ye may,
> I do not ask a long, but glorious Day. (III.i, 31-32)

Almyna initially seems to dismiss her avowals of glory, but her description of the heart is through the familiar metaphor of conquest. Almyna may walk back her focus on public acknowledgement, but nonetheless her romantic desire is reframed as a source of glory. As Bernadette Andrea argues, this speech signals a move away from a "first feminist" emphasis on reason towards the sentimental narrative of the later eighteenth century,[31] but these genres are not incompatible in contemporary discourse. Like Roxolana in Elkanah Settle's *Ibrahim* (1677), Almyna brings together Roman *virtù* with embodied sentiment.

Almyna seeks to convince Almanzor that women have souls through argumentation, but her reasoning is embodied, centering female reproduction. While Galland's Scheherazade tells stories

[31] Bernadette Andrea, *Women and Islam in Early Modern English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 103.

that, coupled with the tale's exoticized romance, underplay the violent threat of the tale, the historical and political specificity Manley brings to the piece returns the stakes to her argumentation, and positions her as a positive iteration of the powerful Roxolana figure.[32] While many critics have characterized Almyna's argumentation as dispassionate logic in contrast to the pathos of the she-tragedy heroines,[33] her reasoning centers feeling, particularly gendered feeling, rather than displaces it. In a speech that echoes Shakespeare's Shylock, Almyna argues that women cannot be different from men because the pain and joy of pregnancy are the same whether male and female children are carried:

> Besides, be not the Means, the Joys, the Pains the same,
> In the production, of the Females, as the Males
> If from the Parents, you derive the Soul,
> When they beget Immortal, feel they no Distinction.
> Or if, the Soul, be with the Life infused,
> Wou'd not the Womb that holds 'em, find a Difference.
> Since then their Beings, and their Birth's the same,
> They dye the same, and the same Way shall rise,
> And to Immortal Life adjudged as you be… (IV.i, 44-45)

Women not only have souls, but they provide the means of evaluating souls. Because Almanzor is incapable of carrying a child, he is an illegitimate arbiter of life. Almyna's insistence on women's political engagement via reproduction and her own rise to the position of sultana resonates with the play's production during the early reign of Queen Anne, the final Stuart monarch[34], who died

[32] Orr, *Empire on the English Stage*, 132-33.

[33] See Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients*, 87; Marsden, *Fatal Desire*, 126-130; Orr, *Empire on the English Stage*, 132-33.
[34] Garcia, *Islam and the English Enlightenment*, 86.

heirless despite seventeen pregnancies. The evaluation of humanity in the womb is given political resonance when performed while an often-pregnant monarch held the throne, and Anne's dynasty-ending inability to produce surviving children in retrospect clouds Almyna's ascension at the play's close.

The sultan orders her execution nonetheless, providing a space for the performance of pathos by Almyna (as played by the great tragedienne Barry) while facing her execution in the moment with stoicism. The Sultan plans to observe her execution unseen, to see if the mental fortitude she demonstrated in the debate holds up at the moment of death. Almyna meets her death with bravery and humility, and at the last minute Almanzor halts the execution, coming to believe that women have as much virtue as men. Almyna's attitude towards her own death as rationality counterbalances the passions:

> Alm. Oh, did I not, by Reason rein the Passions:
> Wou'd they not whirl me, as the Winds about.
> Durst I indulge my Griefs, shou'd I not rage.
> To an extremity of raving Rage.
> Think not I am insensible to Nature.
> I sink this Minute under its oppression!
> Have I not more to suffer, more to Mourn,
> Much more to lose, you only weep a Child,
> But I an Uncle! Sister! Father! Husband!
> Can any Sorrows be compar'd to mine!
> To part with all that can in Life be precious.
> Ev'n then to part when each is dearest to me.
> Now that my flow'r of Life is in the bloom:

When my dear Lord has blest me with his Love,

Let none presume, to weigh their little Woes,

When my superior Griefs, are in the Ballance [sic]. (V.ii, 61-62)

But while she claims that reason prevents her from giving over to sorrow, reason is what magnifies her distress. Grief is countable, and she must have more because she has more to lose. While each member of her family mourns her loss, she must mourn the loss of her own life but also the loss of each of them, as they become in her death dead to her. Almyna's heroism is all the greater for her significant suffering.

The emotional arc focuses on the suffering of women, here both in the particular suffering of Almyna's lovesick sister Zoradia but also in the broader suffering of all women, subject to violent execution at the sultan's whim. The suffering of Restoration tragedy is gendered, made explicit here by Almanzor's Arabian vow. Almyna prophesizes the confrontation between Almanzor and the murdered queens who came before her:

Dost thou not tremble; Sultan, but to think?

How fatal to thee, the Mistake may prove?

What will our Prophet say, at thy last day?

When all thy Queens, shall urge him, to revenge 'em

How will Remorse, oppress thee in thy passage?

Oh, never! never! shalt thou cross the Bridge,

The horrid River, must receive my Lord.

Distraction! Anguish! Horror! tears me,

At but the Imagination of thy Punishment;

Oh! Early wake thee, from this Dream of Fate.

I beg not for my self, I am content to Dye.

So that my Death may be thy last of Crimes. (IV.i, 44-45)

While the tragic queens preceding Scheherazade are subsumed by the succession of her stories in the *Nights*, *Almyna* brings attention back to the earlier horrific violence as the queens join Muhammad in rendering the final judgment. Almyna's power then is drawn, not merely through history and philosophy,[35] but like Scheherazade through the power of narrative. The scene she paints of Almanzor's afterlife haunts his dreams, affecting him more strongly than her appeals to logic and reason. Similarly, Almanzor does not save Almyna through her tales of or arguments about female virtue, but only when she embodies virtue before him at her execution does he relent.[36] He must stage her death in order to enact the performance of virtue that he requires.[37]

The she-tragic pathos of *Almyna* is mostly found in the subplot, engaging with generic expectations by including the performance of female suffering with a secondary character. Almyna's sister Zoradia wastes away for love of the sultan's brother Abdalla, who was engaged to her before he fell in love with Almyna.[38] Like the heroine of *The Tragedy of Zara*, Zoradia is caught between her romantic and familial loyalties, though without Zara's religious conflict:

Zor. Heav'n knows, how well I Love the Sultaness,

Scarce thy own lovely Form, is dearer to me.

Have I not giv'n a Proof of what I say,

---

[35] Ballaster, *Fabulous Orients*, 87.

[36] Bridget Orr, "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and the Creation of Popular Orientalism," *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*, 110.

[37] Elizabeth Kuti, "Scheherazade, *Bluebeard*, and Theatrical Curiosity," in *Scheherazade's Children: Global Encounters with the Arabian Nights*, eds. Philip F. Kennedy and Marina Warner (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 333.

[38] Jean Marsden argues that *Almyna* is only a she-tragedy insofar as it focuses on a female protagonist, but she is a political subject rather than a sexual object for the audience's gaze. I contend that the Zoradia subplot follows Marsden's definition of she-tragedy. See Marsden, *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage, 1660-1720* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), 126-30.

For when her Eyes had robb'd me of thy Heart,

Was not my conquering Sister still belov'd?

So truly lov'd, that all the rougher Passions,

Revenge and Hate, like routed Armies fled before her! (V.i, 54)

Her rival for her lover, albeit inadvertent and unreciprocated, is her sister, to whom she is bonded by both familial ties and monarchal duty, as Almyna is the sultaness for a seemingly brief moment. In fact, the sister supersedes the lover in this passage; she is the victor in love, conquering Abdalla's heart but also Zoradia's love. Women are not only eroticized through objectified suffering; here, the romantic conqueror described by Zoradia is the heroine.

While Almyna is ultimately saved in the end, Abdalla rushes in and fights the Vizier, not knowing that Almyna has been saved. The Vizier wounds him, and as Zoradia rushes to support Abdalla she is accidentally wounded by Abdalla's sword. Zoradia and Abdalla die from their wounds, and Almanzor's cruel vow is punished by the loss of his succession. Zoradia's death is a virtuosic performance of female pathos:

Zor. Come to my Arms, and take a Sister's leave:

I clasp thee like a Lover, not a Rival!

(A Name which Love and Nature most abhors)

Nearer! nearer! We shall do thus no more.

A thousand Kisses, and as many Tears,

On our divided Fates — I am where I wou'd wish,

Thus dying on my lovely Prince's breast.

Grasp me, as if thou hadst for ever lov'd

Since I thus charm'd, can feel no Pains of Death.

Think'st thou above, we shall not meet again?

May I not reign without a Rival there,

I go, to try —oh, Heav'ns—farewel to all. [Dies.]

Alm. Oh, horror! the fair Soul, is fled for ever. (V.ii, 67-68)

Almyna again takes the place of the lover in Zoradia's death speech, which emphasizes their affective bonds. Zoradia's exhortation to Almyna to approach with the accounting of tears and kisses draws attention to the performed physical intimacy performed onstage, which must have been in retrospect all the more poignant as the last scene shared by Barry and Bracegirdle. The length and pathos of Zoradia's speech starkly contrasts with the death of Abdalla, which follows immediately:

Abd. My turn is next, pardon me, gracious Sultan,

Excess of Love, occasion'd my Ingratitude.

Empress to see the safe, was all my Wish.

My poor tormented Heart, was doom'd thy Slave,

I'm to the last, thy faithful suffering Lover.

Be ever Happy; I must meet Zoradia. [Dies.] (V.ii, 67-68)

In half the lines of Zoradia, Abdalla says that his death comes from an excess of feeling, but he does not perform that suffering onstage. While he never takes the murderous vow like his brother, Abdalla is guilty of the same crime as Almanzor and Schahriar by treating women as interchangeable and disposable. Rejecting Zoradia for Almyna in life, he is reunited with her in death, and her sacrifice restores him to the virtue that he himself abdicated. With the main conflict of the play stemming from the belief in the incompleteness of women, Zoradia and Almyna are given an excess of emotional and civic virtue that Abdalla and Almanzor must draw upon.

The treatment of female emotion in the play is somewhat contradictory, navigating between the expressive suffering of Zoradia and the more stoic virtue of Almyna, but the text is most interested in women's capacities, both emotional and intellectual. The framing texts, however, pull

away from both the explicit interest in both gender and in the performance of emotion more broadly. Despite the text's focus on establishing the humanity of women, the play's prologue and epilogue, often spoken by actresses, are instead both performed by men. Colley Cibber's prologue appeals to the audience's "Manlier Judgements," arguing that dramatic tragedy is held to a higher standard than the opera, a trendy art form that only comes from effeminate "Warmer Climes."

> The Actor's Force of Gesture, and his Fire;
> Were those just Graces, join'd to Voice, alas!
> A dark Translated Nonsense then might pass.
> But when you see with dangling Arms, and lifeless Eyes,
> A hum-drum Princess chaunt her Lullabyes.
> Who holds the Ponyard to a Life persued,
> As if not meant to offer Death, but Food.
> Meethinks such Sights shou'd make you sleep, not smile,
> And fairly own 'tis Vox & Preterea Nihil. [Voice and nothing more] (prologue)

The fact that opera is a translation makes it suspicious, an ironic critique given that the narrative of *Almyna* is drawn from an English translation of a French translation. The synesthetic description of lyrics, the "dark Translated Nonsense" renders the linguistic confusion into visual terms, as the compared genres are embodied as performers. Cibber contrasts the passion of masculine drama with the vapidity of feminine opera, the [male] actor's force and fire contrasted with the "lullabyes" (a gendered song genre) of the mediocre princess. The play that follows this prologue not just has a female title character but explicitly articulates a gendered heroism, but the Cibber prologue presents a masculine, nationalist description of genre.

Anticipating the debates around tragedy surrounding Voltaire and Shakespeare,[39] genre is litigated through nation.[40] The eighteenth-century debates around tragedy were in particular anxious about what constituted specifically English tragedy, in contrast to the formal and institutionalized French tragedy. Cibber's prologue negates the French threat to tragedy by ascribing all dramatic prowess to England:

> All Nations are for some Perfection Fam'd,
> Let's not for losing what we have be sham'd:
> Let French-men Dance; th'Italians, Sing, and Paint,
> Perfections we must have from them or want:
> Arms we may teach'em Both, and Both must say,
> Our best Diversion is an English PLAY. (prologue)

Declaiming the forms that the English are (still) not known for, Cibber claims both drama and martial prowess for England over France and Italy. Arms define national borders, and so national borders define genre.

The Cibber prologue litigates genre (and with it, gender), and the Betterton epilogue concentrates on authorship and authority as part of the nationalist project:

> Unless we shou'd the new Italian way,
> Heav'ns then what Admiration you'd betray!
> Nor dare to judge, unknowing what we say.
> The Terror which they move must needs be strong
> Where Wars, and Duels, are perform'd in Song.

---

[39] For more on nationalist debates on tragedy, see Chapter Two.
[40] See Felicity A. Nussbaum, "The Challenge of Tragedy," in *The Oxford Handbook of The Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, ed. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 20140, 368-89; and Nussbaum, "The Unaccountable Pleasure of Eighteenth-Century Tragedy," *PMLA* 129, no. 4 (2014): 688-707.

That Sound in spight of Sense, should please so long!

Did Shakespear, Otway live, they'd live in vain,

Admidst a Race who Nature's force disclaim;

Nature, the truest Touchstone of our Art,

Did but great Nature reassume her part. (epilogue)

Like the Cibber prologue, Thomas Betterton's epilogue focuses on the threat of Italian opera in England, famously parodied in John Gay's *The Beggar's Opera* (1728). Here, Betterton ascribes opera's popularity to its obscurity, that audiences are too afraid to betray ignorance in disliking the performance. The English arms that Cibber proclaims are no match for Italian cultural superiority (in this instance), performed through song. According to Betterton, Shakespeare and Otway, considered the best English tragic playwrights at this moment, are rejected by audiences in favor of the stylized Italian performance. Despite the fact that music was a common part of English spoken-word drama in the eighteenth century, song is presented as unnaturalistic and thus antithetical to true tragedy. The Betterton and Cibber paratexts present a generically restrictive, masculinist, and nationalist vision of tragedy at odds with the generically fluid, proto-feminist, and cosmopolitan play text at its core.

Similarly, in performance the paratexts privilege the male authoritative structures that the play critiques. The epilogue is not performed by a woman, as was commonly done, but by Betterton, who played the murderous Caliph Almanzor in the play. Not only is this play about a woman's public performance of virtue bordered by speeches by men, but the last word is given to the man embodying the character who tries to silence her:

Of you, bright Nymphs, our Author humbly prays,

You wou'd forget what the rough Sultan says.

Convinc'd, at length, he does your Empire own,

And at your feet, lays all his Errors down.

If his Performance, chance to please the Fair?

Joys so refin'd, no youthful Breast can bear:

No more by Fear, or Modesty, conceal'd,

He then will stand your happy Slave, reveal'd. (epilogue)

While Almyna must argue for her humanity, the actor playing Almanzor performs humility. After spending the play embodying the murderous despot, he comically returns to chivalry as a slave in the empire of love, minimizing both the violence performed onstage and the European gendered power dynamics which he and his audience exist in. The paratexts masculinize a text that reinforces and complicates tragedy's focus on female suffering. Just as Almyna seems to pull back from centering her own exemplarity, the play itself shies away from fully embracing the female heroism it articulates.

Looking at *Almyna* beyond the plot similarities to the *Nights* but as an adaptation that reacts to its source's exploration of marital violence turns back attention to the female body in a play most often read as more interested in dispassionate argumentation. While seemingly less centered than in the she-tragedies, female pathos is still the driving emotion in the form of Zoradia's suffering and even to a certain extent in Almyna's, and even Almyna's argumentation refocuses attention not away from but towards the female body. The paratextual turn away from women with bookended didactic male performers dramatizes the restricted potential for women in both the Orient depicted onstage and in the English theater space that surrounds it.

Blue-Beard's Patriarchal Structures

As an eighteenth-century tragedy, a genre defined by female affect and performance, *Almyna* locates both logic and emotion in the female body. Later in the century, the pantomimes performed as afterpieces to tragedies became more central to the success of the patent theaters, influenced by

the economic threat of the illegitimate stages.[41] Colman's afterpiece draws on the popular illegitimate theater genres of pantomime and burletta, emphasizes the play's *mise-en-scène*[42] and the performers' interaction with performed stage business (blocking, choreography, etc.). In George Colman the Younger's *Blue-beard, or Female Curiosity!* (1798), Schahriar from the *Nights* is combined with the European folktale of Bluebeard, published by Charles Perrault in his *Histoires ou contes du temps passé* (1697), as the charactonymic Abomelique. In the tale, a young woman is married to the mysterious Bluebeard, and is given the keys to the castle under the condition that she does not open one door. When she does, she discovers the corpses of his murdered former wives, who had also disobeyed him. The focus of both the Scheherazade frame tale and the Bluebeard story depict the inherent threat in marriage for women, that the most dangerous place can be where women are supposed to be safe (in the home) and the aggressor is their only protector (the husband). In comedy and horror of Colman's *Blue-beard*, the structural violence against women become literal structures, through which *Blue-beard*'s Fatima must negotiate onstage and ultimately dismantle.

The association of Bluebeard with the Oriental despot began in the early eighteenth century with the Oriental tragedy's vision of Ottoman tyranny, compounded by the fact that most Oriental texts as well as the Bluebeard story all arrived in England via absolutist France.[43] In Colman's adaptation, the conditional perpetual murder of Bluebeard and the acknowledged perpetual murder of Schahriar are collapsed in Abomelique's murders:

---

[41] See Jane Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); John O'Brien, *Harlequin Britain: Pantomime and Entertainment, 1690-1760* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

[42] For more on *Blue-beard*'s stage machinery and material culture, see Marjean D. Purinton, "George Colman's *The Iron Chest* and *Blue-Beard* and the Pseudoscience of Curiosity Cabinets," *Victorian Studies* 49, no. 2 (2007): 250-57.

[43] Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century chapbook illustrations for *Bluebeard* and the *Arabian Nights* were interchangeable; see Casie E. Hermansson, *Bluebeard: A Reader's Guide to the English Tradition* (Jackson, MI: University of Mississippi Press, 2009), 53.

> Ibrahim. Ha! now, under favour, I do think that a man's wives are punishment enough, in themselves. Praised be the wholsome Law of Mahomet that stinted a Turk to only four at a time!
>
> Irene. The Bashaw had never more than one at a time; —and 'tis whispered that he beheaded the poor souls one after another: for in spite of his power there's no preventing talking.[44]

The barbarity is at once explained through a misreading of Islam, but the reasoning is rendered futile as Abomelique is monogamous by circumstance. The joke is based on the misogynist stereotype that women are incessant talkers,[45] but it also plays with the Scheherazade story; while Abomelique's wives are killed because each will not stop talking, Scheherazade must never stop talking in order to preserve her life. The humor cuts both ways: while the misogynist joke indicts the audience along with Abomelique for wishing to (permanently) shut women up, the joke, told by the irreverent woman Irene, also resists that violence. Despite his violence, Abomelique cannot fully silence women, as Irene herself shows.

The link between heads and maidenheads made explicit in the *Nights* becomes metaphorical in *Blue-beard*, but the Blue Chamber enacts relationship between the sexual act and knowledge. As in the *Nights*, the punishment for disobedience is beheading by the scimitar. The blame for violence against women is turned back on them, the metaphor for culpability made literal :

> Abom. 'Twas to prevent the harm with which their conduct threaten'd me, that they have suffer'd. Their crimes were on their heads.

---

[44] George Colman, the Younger, *Blue-Beard; or, Female Curiosity! A Dramatick Romance; First Represented at the Theatre Royal Drury Lane, on Tuesday January 16, 1798* (Dublin: Printed by William Porter, (69) Grafton-Street, 1798), I.i, 8. All subsequent citations are in the text.

[45] Barbara M. Benedict, "The Curious Genre: Female Inquiry in Amatory Fiction," *Studies in the Novel* 30, no. 2 (1998): 200.

> Shac. Then their Crimes were as cleanly taken off their shoulders as Scymetar could carry them.—That Curiosity should cost so much! (I.iii, 17)

Shacabac takes Abomelique's metaphor to the logical extreme, as the crimes are removed with their heads. The conflation of women's heads with their transgression brutally plays on the assertion in "An English Padlock" that controlling the mind is the only way to truly exercise power over women. One of the few things that *Blue-beard* does not and cannot show is the consummation of the marriage, but the act of unwanted sex is verbally enacted by Abomelique before his departure: "Yes, Fatima; business of import calls me. —for a few hours I leave you. Soon as the Sun slopes through the azure vault of Heaven, to kiss the mountain's top, and Evening's lengthen'd shadows forerun the dew-drops of the night, then look for my return. Then shall our marriage be accomplished" (II.ii, 26-27). This eroticized description of the evening prompts the excursion of Fatima and Irene, and they perform a sexual penetration without the husband.

Sexual penetration is replaced by the heroine's (and the audience's) penetration of a forbidden private space, much like how the harem or seraglio is framed as inaccessible to western (male) eyes.[46] While "female curiosity can be satisfied when male curiosity cannot be"[47] in the harem, as Lady Mary Wortley Montagu witnesses, in *Bluebeard* that unique access to knowledge is punished. The revelation of the Blue Chamber is the centerpiece of *Blue-beard*, a lavish display of the original production's £2000 mechanical sets[48]:

> SHACABAC puts the Key into the Lock; the Door instantly sinks, with a tremendous crash: and the Blue Chamber appears streaked with vivid streams of Blood. The figures in the

[46] Kuti, "Scheherazade, *Bluebeard*, and Theatrical Curiosity," 327.

[47] Kuti, "Scheherazade, *Bluebeard*, and Theatrical Curiosity," 327.

[48] Paula R. Backscheider, "From *The Emperor of the Moon* to the Sultan's Prison," *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 43 (2014): 3.

> Picture, over the door, change their position, and ABOMELIQUE is represented in the action of beheading the Beauty he was, before, supplicating. —The Pictures, and Devices, of Love, change to subjects of Horror and Death. The interior apartment (which the sinking of the door discovers) exhibits various Tombs, in a sepulchral building;— in the midst of which ghastly and supernatural forms are seen; —some in motion, some fix'd—In the centre, is a large Skeleton seated on a Tomb, (with a Dart in his hand) and, over his head, in characters of Blood, is written
>
> "THE PUNISHMENT OF CURIOSITY.' (I.iii, 18-19)

Abomelique's marital tableau is transformed into the murder of the same woman, implying that the romantic supplication and the beheading are part and parcel of the same impulse. This punishment of curiosity highlights the similarities between violence and sex that are present, rather than presenting a dramatic contrast. As the phallic key penetrates the lock, the room is streaked with hymenal blood, the padlock again standing for female chastity. *Blue-beard*'s focus on curiosity is not found in the other *Nights*-based texts. If padlocks can only be successfully put on the mind, then curiosity is the potential affect when unlocked. On one level, then, the Blue Chamber is punishment for women's mental agency, as defying the husband's rule turns the woman into part of the horrors she had stumbled upon. But on another, Colman's Blue Chamber evokes Genesis when Eve defies patriarchal authority and eats from the Tree of Knowledge, and the horror comes from the recognition that marriage and murder are one and the same, a gruesome enactment of the logical extension of women's loss of personhood under coverture. Its acknowledgement of the presence of violence in marriage, not that violence itself, that is new and fantastic. The Blue Chamber's padlock dramatizes the way in which the cultural value of chastity imprisons women, enabling rather than preventing sexual violence.

The oppression that is built into the stage business must then be then physically destroyed; while Scheherazade is saved by her continuous language, Fatima's salvation comes outside of the text, only made visible by these extensive stage directions:

> Fati. While Selim lives—So near me too, —my life is precious, and I struggle to preserve it. [Stage directions] She struggles with ABOMELIQUE, who attempts to kill her; —and, in the struggle, snatches the Dagger from the pedestal of the Skeleton.—The Skeleton rises on his feet—lifts his arm which holds the Dart, and keeps it suspended. At that instant the entire wall of the Sepulchre falls to pieces, and admits SELIM to the ground.—Behind—among fragments of the building, a body of SPAHIS is discovered, on foot, with ABOMELIQUE'S SLAVES under their Sabres, in postures of submission, and farther back is seen a large Troop of Horse—The neighbouring Country terminates the view. (II. "scene last" [viii], 44)

Fatima's resistance triggers the action that destroys the walls of the sepulchre, admitting her lover and the surrounding slaves and armies. In order to preserve her life, the structure of the chamber must be torn down. With that, Abomelique is defeated by neither Selim nor Fatima but by the representation of his victims: "After a hard contest, SELIM overthrows ABOMELIQUE at the foot of the Skeleton.—The Skeleton instantly plunges the Dart, which he has held suspended, into the breast of ABOMELIQUE, and sinks with him beneath the earth. (A volume of Flame arises, and the earth closes)" (II.[viii], 44). The Skeleton is gendered male through the impersonal masculine, but it is marked by the "punishment of curiosity" sign, a trait that the play's subtitle genders female, as are all the buried victims in the chamber. Just as in *Almyna* where the previous victims haunt Almanzor, the representative of the previous victims of Abomelique kill him and drag him down to hell, "a stage-managing tyrant whose stage machinery is ultimately destroyed."[49] The *Nights* frame

[49] Kuti, "Scheherazade, *Bluebeard*, and Theatrical Curiosity," 324.

tale leaves Scheherazade's predecessors behind, Almanzor's wives in *Almyna* return through Almyna's humanizing performance and later his nightmare soliloquy; and in *Blue-beard* the figurative representative of Abomelique's victims revenge themselves.

Jealous Husbands "Too Dreadful to Bear"

As much as these adaptations of the *Nights* frame tale focus on the threat of violence against women, they offer an exploration of sexuality that was often specifically appealing to women. In his 1711 treatise *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, deplores what he sees as the misplaced erotic interest in Oriental tales that feature black men offered a female audience:

> That about a hundred Years after his [Shakespeare's] Time, the Fair Sex of this Island shou'd, by other monstrous Tales, be so seduc'd, as to turn their Favour chiefly on the Persons of the Tale-tellers; and change their natural Inclination for fair, candid, and courteous Knights, into a Passion for a mysterious Race of black Enchanters: such as of old were said to creep into Houses, and lead captive silly Women…The tender Virgins, losing their natural Softness, assume this tragick Passion, of which they are highly susceptible, especially when a suitable kind of Eloquence and Action attends the Character of the Narrator. A thousand DESDEMONA's [sic] are then ready to present themselves, and wou'd frankly resign Fathers, Relations, Country-men, and Country it-self, to follow the Fortunes of a Hero of the black Tribe.[50]

Shaftesbury is afraid that this literary popularity translates onto the bodies of the narrators themselves, that Desdemona-like women would turn away from English patriarchy (in both its legal

[50] Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 155-56.

and familial form as well as its literary tradition) towards itinerant black heroes, if given the opportunity. But even if not, these virgins are losing their softness, performing the tragic passion normally restricted to the stage. Desdemona may be acceptable when contained in Shakespeare's play, but Shaftesbury panics at the thought that she will leave the theatrical space and multiply, enacting her rebellion against father and state on a large scale. This fear points to the slippery divisions between performer and audience in the early eighteenth century: women spectators are particularly vulnerable to tragic passion, most often performed by women, and this affect refuses to stay confined to the realm of the stage. Shaftesbury sees the Oriental tragedy as offering women an alternative to the passivity demanded by patriarchy.

But what Shaftesbury sees as a cultural threat is an opportunity for Eliza Haywood. Shaftesbury's fears are realized in her novella *The Padlock, or No Guard without Virtue* (1728), where the married heroine escapes her captivity through the help of an unnamed black servant. The fact that he later "transforms" into a Spanish nobleman only heightens the connection to the "Black Enchanters" stealing white women from the control of European men. Haywood synthesizes the tropes of Oriental tales with the narrative of Cervantes' novella *El celoso extremeño* [*The Jealous Husband*] (1613) in order to articulate a positive form of female sexuality, depicted as a realizable potential by the fantastic sources and adaptations surrounding it. The Cervantes tale would also become an extremely popular afterpiece by Charles Dibdin and Isaac Bickerstaffe, also called *The Padlock* (1768), notable for Dibdin's turn as the enslaved black West Indian Mungo, which was frequently performed both in London and in the colonial theaters of Kingston and Calcutta. Haywood's *Padlock* is one of many cultural narratives where deviant sexuality is racialized, but unlike in Galland's *Nights* this deviance creates the possibility for female sexual agency within patriarchy.

In Haywood's *The Padlock* Don Lepidio, a miserly old man marries a young, impoverished virgin Violante. Fearful that she will cuckold him, he locks her up in their home with no contact with

the outside world, only to have her wooed by young nobleman Don Honorius, who impersonates a disabled black servant, employed as too hideous to tempt infidelity. This premise is more or less constant across these three texts, but the resolution differs. In Cervantes, the old man Carrizales does not realize that his wife Leonora truly loves him, and he gives his blessing to her marriage to the young Loaysa after his death. Mourning the loss of her husband, Leonora joins a nunnery and the nobleman Loaysa leaves town, humiliated by his failure to both seduce and marry her. For Dibdin, the tale comically is resolved as the old Diego is chagrined at his folly in trying to marry a young woman when competing with a virile lover, and gives a generous dowry so Leonora and the nobleman Leander may marry. While Haywood also ends with the marriage of the young lovers like Dibdin, her ending is less the comedy of manners resolution than the virtue rewarded at the end of a dark fairy tale. Her adultery gives the old Don Lepidio grounds for divorce, and Honorius petitions Rome for a dispensation for Violante's second marriage. While in the *Nights* and *Almyna* the murderous despot is rewarded with the love of the heroine, in *The Padlock* Don Lepidio's violence loses him his marriage and Violante is able to create a more egalitarian marriage with Don Honorius. Together with the other texts discussed in this chapter, *The Padlock* is about the jealousy, deceit, and violence within matrimony. But while the others demonstrate this metaphorically and taken to the extreme, in Haywood's novels the horror comes not from staged executions or bloody chambers, but from the banal evil of intimacy in an unhappy, oppressive marriage.

The Padlock exoticizes the Spanish *Jealous Husband* by evoking the Orient, building upon the now decades-long tradition of passionate, possessing sultans on the stage. Haywood's text shares both imagery and thematic concerns with the frame tale of the *Nights*, but even Dibdin's afterpiece calls attention to this continuity, as Leander sings of a tyrant Turk's cruelty against women:

> Leand. There was a cruel and malicious Turk, who was called Heli Abdallah Mahomet Scah; now this wicked Turk had a fair Christian slave named Jezabel, who not consenting to his

> beastly desires, he draws out his sabre, and is going to cut of [sic] her head; here's what he says to her (sings and plays). Now you shall hear the slave's answer (sings and plays again). Now you shall hear how the wicked Turk, being greatly enraged, is again going to cut off the fair slave's head (sings and plays again). Now you shall hear —[51]

While the biblical Jezebel was punished for seducing King Ahab away from the worship of the Hebrew god, here she is a Christian slave under threat from a Muslim despot. Leander's song echoes the plot of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainment* frame tale, as well as the second calendar's tale of the jealous genie who executes his imprisoned lover. Like in the *Nights*, the violence here is sexual: Jezabel is beheaded (by Scah's saber) for refusing to consent to losing her maidenhead, while Scheherazade's post-coital storytelling is the only way she resists execution by her father's bowstring.

As in the *Nights*, it is the black male body that undermines the fidelity of the wife. Rather than turn the husband into a cuckold, this servant is in fact chosen by the husband to serve the wife because he believes the black (and deformed) body cannot possibly be erotic to Violante:

> There had been no other Person in her Chamber but a black slave, one of the most deformed and hideous of those Wretches Lepidio had chose out for her Attendant; he was lame of one Arm, blind of one Eye, and almost double with Crookedness…besides he could not speak a Word of Spanish, so there was no Likelyhood, whoever her unknown Lover was, that he should make Choice of such a Person, in an Affair that requir'd so much Fidelity and Cunning. (62–63)

While in the *Nights* the sultaness' preference for the debased slave over the exalted sultan confirms her depravity, in *The Padlock* it is the specific ways that the servant is raced, classed, and disabled that seemingly neutralizes any erotic threat. The man's deformed body is almost a mathematical problem,

[51] Charles Dibdin, *The Padlock: A Comic Opera: As it is perform'd by His Majesty's Servants at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane* (London: Printed for W. Griffin, at Garrick's Head, in Catharine Street, Strand, 1768), I.vii, 12.

having half the working eyes and arms but double the crookedness of the back. His foreignness is another deformity, depriving him of the ability to communication.

The *Nights* and the tales it inspired are invoked as they are simultaneously dismissed seemingly in favor of narrative realism: "Had *Violante* given Credit to those Tales of Faries [sic], Genies, or Spirits which so amuse the World; she would have thought this Billet had been brought by supernatural Means; she could neither imagine from whom it should be sent, nor by what Hand convey'd to that Place, the *Duenna*, who waited on her, was a Relation of her Husband's, and rather contributed to heighten his jealous Chimeras, than reduce him to more Reason."[52] Unlike the other narratives of the jealous husband, where the black servant is another character, Lepidio's black servant is revealed to be Leonora's anonymous lover in disguise, a process described as both inhabiting a theatrical role and as a magical transformation, not completely reconcilable as a capitulation to realism as suggested above:

> Being told of the Capricio of Don Lepidio, and that he entertained as servants in his House all those that by Deformity secur'd his jealous Fears, I transform'd my self to a shape the most shocking I could invent, black'd my Face and Hands with an Ointment I got for the Purpose, and bending my Body almost double, and counterfeiting a lameness, in the Habit of a Slave, I got Admittance to the Family; and by appearing particularly frightful, gain'd his particular Favour." (75)

Paradoxically, the black body is both present and absent in *The Padlock*: as a part of the proto-Gothic horror of the text,[53] the slave's body is described in far more detail than any other in the text; yet he

---

[52] Eliza Haywood, *The Mercenary Lover: or, The Unfortunate Heiresses. Being a True Secret History of a City Amour. By the Author of Reflections on the various Effects of Love. The Third Edition. To which is added, The Padlock: or, No Guard without Virtue. A Novel* (London: Printed for N. Dobb, in the Strand: and sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1728), 62. All subsequent citations are in the text.

[53] Haywood anticipates Charlotte Dacre's racial Gothic in *Zofloya, or The Moor* (1806). Dacre's Victoria is the evil inverse of Violante: the latter is saved from imprisonment by that man whose artificial black body first fills her with terror; Victoria's captivity is leads to her depravity, seduced by the apparition of the slave Zofloya. Zofloya encourages her murder spree. In the end, his beautiful dark body is transformed and deformed, revealing Zofloya

is also an apparition, a disguise of the able-bodied white aristocrat. The most corporeal of textual bodies is in fact the most intangible: while the slave's body is blazoned, it turns out not to be a real body but a performance of racialized disability. The infidelity in the seraglio is echoed in Haywood's *The Padlock*, where a black servant is able to penetrate the space of the aristocratic woman. The padlock once again cannot preserve a wife's chastity: in underestimating subaltern bodies, the patriarch gives the keys away.

Both Galland's *Nights* and Cervantes' *The Jealous Husband* elide the forced sex that comes with forced marriage, but it is a crucial part of how Haywood sets up Lepidio's cruelty. Haywood explores sexual violence in marriage as both reprehensible and inevitable. In 1736, Chief Justice Sir Matthew Hale articulated the English common law view of marital rape: "But the husband cannot be guilty of a rape committed by himself upon his lawful wife, for by their mutual matrimonial consent and contract the wife hath given up herself in this kind unto her husband which she cannot retract."[54] Married women under coverture lost all legal personhood, and so for Hale it follows then that her physical person has no protections independent of the husband's desires. Haywood subverts the association of seduction with rape in order to normalize a heterosexual love that mandates both female consent and sexual expression. In Cervantes, the marriage of Carrizales (Lepidio) and Leonora (Violante) is acknowledged as consummated, and Leonora's youth makes her receptive to her restricted situation:

> The Silver of the old Man's hoary Hairs, to the Eyes of Leonora seemed to be of pure Gold; because the first Love which Virgins enjoy, leaves an Impression in their Soul, as a Seal doth

to be Satan. In both texts, the black deformed body is not fully of the real world, enabling the fulfillment of these women's desires.

[54] Sir Matthew Hale, *History of the Pleas of the Crown* (1736). Hale's doctrine was the basis for English common law on marital rape until rulings in Scotland in 1989 and England in 1991. With the statutory law on sexual offenses of 1976, the language defining rape seemed to preclude rape within marriage; this language was removed in the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act of 1994.

> in Wax. His strict Guard upon her, seemed to her to be advised Circumspection; for she did think and believe, that what passed with her, the like passed with all those that were newly married. Her Thoughts never went a gadding beyond the Walls of her own House; nor did her Will desire any one Thing, save what was her Husband's Pleasure.[55]

Leonora's virginity functions as a magic spell: because she has no comparison, she falls in love with her husband. While she later sees the comely figure of Loaysa and thinks about how sex with him would be preferable to her husband, she does not actually commit adultery. In fact, Carrizales' sexual jealousy is self-imposed, and finding his wife in bed with another man is actually the result of her exhausting him by fighting off his attempted rape:

> But yet, notwithstanding all this, the Virtue and Goodness of Leonora was such, that in that Time which was most needful for her, she shewed her Valour against those villanous Enforcements and base Strivings of this cunning Impostor; and that with such strong and powerful a Resistance, that he was not able to overcome her, but wearied himself in vain, so that she went away with the Victor; and both of them being quite tired out, and having over-watch'd themselves, fell fast asleep.[56]

Leonora's resistance to rape is a mark of her chastity, irrespective of her later acknowledged attraction to Loaysa. Carrizales essentially dies too quickly: his assumption that any wife of his would be unfaithful means that he is convinced by the most basic of appearances that she is unchaste. His imprisonment of Leonora is a symptom of his excessive jealousy, but causes no

---

[55] Miguel de Cervantes, *Novellas Exemplares: or, Exemplary Novels, in Six Books. Viz. 1. The Two Damsels. 2. Lady Cornel. Bentivoglio. 3. The Generous Lover. 4. The Force of Blood. 5. The Spanish Lady. 6. The Jealous Husband. Illustrated with A great Variety of Remarkable Incidents, exceeding pleasant and profitable, tending to promote Virtue and Honour. Written Originally in Spanish, By the inimitable Cervantes, Author of Don Quixot. Translated by Mr. Tho. Shelton. A New Edition: Revised and Compared with the Original by Mr. Mendez: With a Preface, giving an Account of the Work* (London: Printed for and Sold by C. Hitch in Pater-noster Row, S. Bert in Ave-mary Lane, J. Brindley, H. Chapelle, and W. Shropshire in New Bond-street, and J. Atkinson in Lincoln's-inn Square, 1743), 6:346.

[56] Cervantes, *The Jealous Husband*, 6:385.

consequences to Leonora herself; only creating the circumstances for the plottings of Loaysa and the betrayal of Luys.

Haywood is far more interested in the effect that this forced confinement has on the imprisoned wife than Cervantes, where the tragedy becomes that the jealous husband cannot see that his wife loves him despite his behavior. In Haywood, rape is central to Violante's suffering. The names are changed from the translation from Spanish (though still Latinate) to recognizable English charactonyms. Like Henry Fielding's Squire Allworthy, Don Honorius is a virtuous man, despite wooing a married woman and taking her away from her husband, whose own name shares an etymology with the pungent and ignobly named pepperwort. Violante comes from violet, a color associated with nobility but also a flower used in classical burial ceremonies, echoing how Lepidio buries Violante alive within his fortress. Violante also shares a homonymic relationship with "violated." Haywood is specific about the effects on Violante that Lepidio's imprisonment has on her mind and person, and her suffering is from both isolation and violation:

> The Disgust between them grew at last so high, that not all the Efforts of Virtue and Duty could refrain her from thinking of him with a perfect Hate; and those Endearments which she at first but feigned grew now so detestable, that it was only by Compulsion he enjoyed her as his Wife. The Rites of Marriage can only be term'd blest when excited by mutual Warmth of Love and Inclination: Violante's forc'd Love was now so much abated, that the Grave would be now more welcome than his Embraces, and so abhorent were they become, that she almost fear'd to look or speak in a Manner not disobliging, least it should encline him to desire the Gratification of —— which was too dreadful to bear. (59)

Love between husband and wife without the desire of both parties is not "blest," and more importantly it is "forc'd." The passage is ambiguous about the status of consent in the sexual relationship: Violante may compel and force herself to have sex, but the lack of the reflexive also

suggests that it is Don Lepidio who forces (that is, rapes) her. The sexual act is so horrific that the violence interrupts the syntax itself, too dreadful for Violante and the narrator (and reader) to bear. Lepidio's total access to Violante's body and his legal imprisonment of her satisfy his basic desires and fears:

> Lepidio of the two was the least unhappy, the Authority of a Husband giving him the Enjoyment of the Woman he lov'd, and satisfying the Dictates of his Jealousy, by taking away even a Possibility of being wrong'd; but she was a most wretched Creature at once, compell'd to aid the Rapture she detested, and without even the Consolation of knowing her Inclinations a Sacrifice to her Duty, since all she did was forc'd, and she no longer could make use of any Endeavours to think kindly of this Tyrant of her Tranquility. (59-60)

Coverture gives Lepidio complete control of Violante's movements and body, which gives him an agency that she is denied, but which also renders him a tyrannical ruler. Bodily violation excuses the otherwise potentially controversial depiction of wife who secretly corresponds with her lover, runs away with him, and is then divorced.[57] Yet more importantly, describing sex between this married couple in a way that also evokes rape paradoxically makes the seduction and abduction of the wife by the lover the model of chaste love. By foregrounding coercion in her depiction of marriage, Haywood does not oppose but aligns autonomy with fidelity and chastity with sexuality.

Although the May-December marriage at the center of the tale may suggest that the difference in Violante's marriages are based on the individual attractions (or lack thereof) of each husband, Haywood ends the tale clearly articulating the fault lies within the marriage itself:

> Marriage made no Alteration in the Behaviour of these two worthy Persons to each other, unless it were to render them more endearing, both were perfectly satisfy'd with each other's

[57] Toni Bowers, *Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance, 1660-1760* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 247. Bowers argues that the dichotomy of "force" [rape] and "fraud" [seduction] creates a model of resistance through submission for eighteenth-century Tory writers (1-25).

> Conduct, and Confinement was a Stranger to their mutual Confidence. Nor indeed is there any true Love accompany'd with Distrust, all naturally hate to be suspected, and tho' Violante never had a Love for Don Lepidio, the Strength of her Virtue would have carry'd her Endeavours so far, that in Time perhaps she might have been brought to do that out of Tenderness, which at first she but submitted to thro' Duty; and 'tis possible, that had Honorius, with all his Charms, fallen into the same Measures, her Admiration of him might by Degrees have worn off, and she but with Pain have endur'd a Restraint so ungenerous. All Husbands therefore should observe this Maxim, to rule rather by Choice than Compulsion, for if the Inclination is against you, you but in vain think to confine the Body, some Way or other will be found to circumvent your Caution. (82)

Haywood closes with a couplet that echoes Prior's closing couplet in "An English Padlock": "*He, who, to his Interest, the* Fair *would bind, / By* Love *must place a* Padlock *on her mind*" (82). But Haywood's formulation of love, which cannot be "accompany'd with Distrust," is incompatible with both literal and metaphoric padlocks. Toni Bower argues that this reversal is "overkill" reaching levels of parody,[58] but read in comparison to other adaptations of the *Nights* and of the *Jealous Husband*, what is striking about the sexual violence is its banality: the emphasis is less on her chastity belt but on the impact her captivity has, and most especially the trials found in any compelled marriage, on her psyche. Don Honorius' transformation from the chrysalis of the deformed, black body into the handsome, rich nobleman may be almost magical, but the ending makes clear that he in and of himself is not Violante's salvation, rather it is a marriage based on mutual trust that does not diminish the consensual sexuality found in two lovers. Female sexuality is both crucial to the literary expression of female subjectivity as well as patriarchy's nightmare chimera that justifies state control over women's bodies.

[58] Bowers, *Force or Fraud*, 246-47.

While they are limited insofar as none of these texts are able to fully articulate a vision of female sexuality outside the bounds of marriage, these narratives of marital brutality influenced by the *Nights* make sexual violence in marriage not fanciful as much as reveal it to be endemic to the institution. Thinking of these texts as adaptations clarifies the stakes of the respective texts. Reading the *Nights*, Manley, Colman, and Haywood together shows how these seemingly Orientalist texts are not favorably contrasting a despotic East with a free England; rather, these Orientalized narratives create a space to explore the violence enacted daily at home. *Almyna* presents not a dispassionate argument for women's humanity but an embodied justification for a female body politic. These political structures become literal structures in the staging in *Blue-beard*, and the tearing of the set grounds an extravagant piece of theater in the material world. In contrast to the hyperbolic afterpieces like *Blue-beard* and Dibdin's *Padlock*, Haywood's *Padlock* is notable for the way it depicts a damsel and her distress as quotidian and banal, rendering it all the more terrifying. The Scheherazade story in eighteenth-century English writing serves not to emphasize the magic and the exotic in depictions of despotic and tyrannical marriages so much as make the violence of patriarchy palpable and real.

Chapter Four

The *Arabian Nights* on the Popular Stage

In a column in *The Theatrical Inquisitor*, the anonymous Peeping Tom[1] describes one theater, the *East London*, as "so exclusively frequented by the *Ultra-orientalists*, as to escape the cognizance of us *occidentalists*."[2] The Oriental/Occidental framework plays on the geographic locations of the theaters, with Covent Garden and Drury Lane in the West End and many of the minor theaters clustered in the East End, as the name of the theater indicates. With that, the patrons of the respective theaters are given these identities. Moreover, Peeping Tom emphasizes the strangeness of these other spectators, who remain completely unknown by the West(ern) theater-goers, to which he belongs. As Saree Makdisi has argued, London has not been fully Occidentalized itself, and the binary framework "us" versus "them" expresses not simply a metropolis contrasted with imperial subjects but also a class and geographic conflict within the city population.[3] Late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century theater is the most powerful art form to this public, with a wider reach than print.[4] In this description of the *East London*, however, its patrons out-Orientalize the Orient as the more extreme version, so distant to the newspaper's audience as to be unseen. The various ethnic, regional, and colonial characters on the popular stage, separate from the actors portraying them,

---

[1] In legend, Peeping Tom was the man struck blind for watching Lady Godiva ride naked through Coventry. Peeping Tom as a character and as a nickname for a voyeur originates in eighteenth-century accounts. "peeping Tom, n.". OED Online. June 2018. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/237411?redirectedFrom=peeping+tom& (accessed August 31, 2018).

[2] *Theatrical Inquisitor, and Monthly Mirror* 14, no. 78 (January 1819), 21.

[3] Saree Makdisi, *Making England Western: Occidentalism, Race and Imperial Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014), 75.

[4] For example, David Worrall estimates that George Colman the Younger's *Inkle and Yarico* (1787) was performed for audiences of around a total of 48,000 people in the 1788-90 seasons at Covent Garden, assuming two-thirds full houses. See David Worrall, *Harlequin Empire: Race, Ethnicity and the Drama of the Popular Enlightenment* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007), 1.

depicted the increasingly complex and contradictory national identity[5] of the bodies that made up the audience. In a growing imperial world, anyone was at risk of becoming an Other.[6]

With the image of these "ultra-orientalist" spectators populating the audiences of the East End, the popularity of Oriental settings for comedic afterpieces suggests commonality between the London audiences and the Eastern characters onstage, rather than a relationship based on difference. This minor wordplay enacts a larger preoccupation with the otherness within the metropole, the "street Arabs" in the slums of London.[7] This strangeness is based in class differences and the corresponding politics of taste, but it is also rendered through racial terms. Any exoticism is grounded in a place-based framework that is not just urban or English but of London in particular. This chapter will examine adaptations of the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* which proliferated in this theatrical climate. These comedic pieces do not solely work at exoticizing a mythical East, but also reflect the strangeness engendered by London theatrical culture. With questions of audience identification, alienation was not necessarily aligned with perceived racial difference; similarly, identification was not solely based in cultural sameness.

While earlier I have argued for the ways in which the process of adaptation worked to articulate theories of genre in the first century after the theaters reopened, the popular theater adaptations of the *Nights* operate in the ways we usually think of adaptation, as when a familiar book is adapted into a film or television series. By the 1780s, the tales of the *Nights* were familiar cultural properties, and so these productions are playing with both generic conventions and narrative expectations. Antoine Galland's translation of *Alf layla wa laya* into French as *Les mille et une nuits*

---

[5] See Michael Ragussis, *Theatrical Nation: Jews and Other Outlandish Englishmen in Georgian Britain* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010); and Daniel O'Quinn, *Staging Governance: Theatrical Imperialism in London, 1770-1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), 11.

[6] Kathleen Wilson, "The Lure of the Other: Sheridan, Identity and Performance in Kingston and Calcutta," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 27, no. 3-4 (2015): 513-14.

[7] Makdisi, *Making England Western*, 76-77

(1704-1717) was the first appearance of the *Nights* in a European language, and the English translation appeared almost simultaneously by the anonymous translators of London's Grub Street as the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments* (1706-1721). Galland's *Nights* or its initial Grub Street translation served as the basis for all English editions of the *Nights* until Arabist and lexicographer Edward Lane's *A New Translation of the Tales of a Thousand and One Nights; Known in England as the Arabian Nights' Entertainments* (1838-40).[8] The eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century imaginary of the *Nights* was based on one singular translation and edition, a consistency that no longer exists in English-language engagement to the *Nights*, which now includes a variety of circulated translations with no one edition dominating popular readership.[9] Theatrical adaptation is an especially productive frame for the heterogeneity of the London stage and populace because of its metatheatricality, which refers to those theatrical practices that emphasize the artificiality of representation. Adaptation is a metatheatrical practice because the play always exists in reference to another, especially when the popular theater in particular was often explicit about its adaptation of narratives from other genres. At the end of the eighteenth century, the various stories of the *Nights* were common referents, and so their stage adaptations engage intertextually with both the source text as well as the plethora of other adaptations of the same material. This calls attention to the specific

[8] Editions of the *Nights* that appeared after Galland but before Lane include *Arabian Nights Translated into French from the Arabian Mss, by M. Galland and Now Done into English from the Last Paris Edition* (London, 1736); *Beauties of the Arabian Nights Entertainments, Consisting of the most entertaining stories* (London, 1791); J. Cooper, ed., *The Oriental Moralist; or the Beauties of the Arabian Nights Entertainments, translated from the original and adopted with suitable reflections adapted to each story* (London: Newbery, 1791); Richard Gough, trans. and ed., *Arabian Nights Entertainments. Translated into French from the Arabian MSS. by Antoine Galland…and now rendered into English* (Edinburgh: Longman, 1798); Jonathan Scott, trans., *Arabian Nights to which is added a Selection of New Tales* (London, 1811); G.S. Beaumont, trans., *Arabian Nights' Entertainments: or, the Thousand and One Nights. Tr. from the Fr. of M. Galland by G.S. Beaumont* (London: Mathews & Leigh, 1811); and *Arabian Nights to which is added a Continuation of the Arabian Nights' Entertainments* (Liverpool: Nuttal & Fischer, 1814). These editions were all based wholly or in part on Galland's translation of the Syrian Arabic manuscript: some were new English translations of Galland's French, some were edited or expanded Grub Street translations. For more on the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, see Chapter Three.

[9] Though it could be argued that once again a singular interpretation has superseded all others in Anglo-American culture: the 1992 Disney animated film adaptation of *Aladdin*.

ways that each text approaches the material and the specificities of different actors' artistic choices, highlighting the diversity of the London theater.

The legal circumstances of drama in the period produced two distinct theater cultures that occupied different regions of the city and placed different emphasis on text, music, and the body. The separation was simultaneously the result of pantomime's popularity as well as the conditions that allowed it to thrive. While London had two theaters operating under royal patent since the Restoration, smaller theaters like Lincoln's Inn-Fields had opened since, where John Rich popularized the English pantomime in the 1720s. But the genre evolved in response to the theatrical duopoly reaffirmed by the Licensing Act of 1737. The Licensing Act, enacted as a result of controversial stagings that satirized the Walpole administration, restricted the performance of spoken drama to the two patent theaters at Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Any other theaters, known as the illegitimate stage, were required to stage music or dance genres, developing and proliferating the pantomime and the burletta (a form of musical comedy).[10] But while the patent theaters had no generic restrictions on the repertoire, and thus could also perform popular theater genres on their own stages, the illegitimate theaters' plays were not subject to prior approval by the Examiner (though they were often subject to regulation by various town magistrates). This arguably gave the illegitimate theaters opportunities for satire and critique and musical experimentation often unavailable to the legitimate stage.

The late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century popular theater is characterized by generic crossings between the Theatres Royal and the minor theaters. Pantomime had proliferated as afterpieces to the spoken drama mainpiece, with half-price admission to the afterpiece alone,[11] in

[10] For more on the burletta as genre, see Phyllis T. Dircks, *The Eighteenth-Century English Burletta* (Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, 1999).

[11] Worrall, *Harlequin Empire*, 24.

addition to the demand on the illegitimate stage. By the end of the eighteenth century, the generic demarcations between the patent and the illegitimate theaters were beginning to blur, as genres formed by the minor theaters like melodrama and burletta increasingly crossed over into the Theatres Royal. On the other hand, Charles Dibdin and other theater managers would perform spoken drama retitled as burletta, adding song and dance portions and shifting from a five-act to a three-act structure (and were often threatened with legal action by the patent theaters for doing so).[12] As Jane Moody has shown, the increasing impossibility of policing the generic boundaries of the patent and illegitimate theaters led in part to the Theatres Act of 1843, which ended the patent theater monopoly on spoken drama and restricted the powers of censorship, though British theater censorship would not be fully repealed until 1968.[13] Because the patent theaters had to submit all texts (including afterpieces) to the Examiner, pantomime and burletta performed on the legitimate stage is more available than descriptions or texts from the illegitimate stage.[14]

While eighteenth-century theater as a whole was engaged in adaptation for both practical and artistic ends, the popular theater was especially built on referentiality, as Jane Moody argues: "Appropriation…became a process by which the authority of an existing narrative may be implicitly questioned or pointedly reinvented. Rather than castigating illegitimate plays as dully derivative, we need to recognise the sleights of hand which such adaptations often performed in the interstices of narratives not their own."[15] For David Hume, the pleasure of theater, both comedy and tragedy, comes in part from the knowledge that the stage is imitation, and that "imitation is always of itself

---

[12] Frederick Burwick, *Playing to the Crowd: London Popular Theatre, 1780-1830* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 176. See also Jeffrey N. Cox, "Re-viewing Romantic Drama," *Literature Compass* 1 (2004), 17-18.

[13] Jane Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 73-74.

[14] In 1820, Larpent chastised Drury Lane for neglecting to submit afterpieces for his review (Worrall, *Harlequin Empire*, 168).

[15] Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre*, 81

agreeable"[16] The popular theater is not just an imitation of life, as Hume suggests of tragedy, but an imitation of imitations: for every *Doctor Faustus*, there is (at least one) *Harlequin Faustus*.

In this chapter, I argue that the popular theater destabilizes the points of identification onstage, obscuring clear boundaries between the dramatized East and the Western spectator: the Oriental settings and the London of the theater itself are often collapsed, emphasizing commonality rather than exoticism with an audience described within its own city as "ultra-oriental" by the *Theatrical Inquisitor*. This destabilization often occurs through metatheatricality rather than by encouraging realist forgetting. While metatheatricality in eighteenth-century tragedy focused on eloquence and the transference of sympathy through pathos, in pantomime it is based on bodily functions (hunger, arousal, fear), which evokes Hume's characterization of emotion as corporeal and involuntary, as discussed in Chapter 2. As I will argue in relation to several exemplary adaptations of *The Arabian Nights*, Charles Dibdin's *The Magic of Orosmanes; or, Harlequin Slave and Sultan: a Pantomime, drawn from the Arabian Legends* (1785) and *The Valley of Diamonds; or, Harlequin Sinbad* (1814), as well as a pantomimic sequence in Richard Brinsley Sheridan and George Colman the Younger's *The Forty Thieves: A Grand Melo-Dramatic Romance* (1806), tragic situations become comic when the basic systems of the body are emphasized rather than the spoken word, a legally protected form of performance. In addition to privileging the basic expressive body over the sentimental, comedy was also communicated through the collapsing of the Oriental settings with the London milieu where these plays were performed. The urban landscape of John O'Keeffe's *Aladdin* (1788) and *The Little Hunch-back* (1789) trouble stable depictions of difference within the metropolis. These disparate texts engage with the tales of *Arabian Nights* as neither solely an exoticized entertainment nor as metaphor for domestic concerns, but rather in order to dramatize an increasingly cosmopolitan world in plays that resist easily separating a metropolis from its broader empire.

[16] David Hume, "Of Tragedy," in *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1985), 220.

In these pantomime versions, the lack of designated dialogue provides a challenge to literary and theater scholars. In both manuscript and printed editions of Harlequin plays, the bulk of the text is a general description of stage action, with minimal dialogue or specific stage directions. It is unlikely that performances were consistent across nights of the same production, let alone across seasons, and the surviving text is suggestive at best. These texts remain understudied in the scholarship of Georgian and Romantic theater. Bridget Orr's overview of the period, "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and the Creation of Popular Orientalism" in Saree Makdisi and Felicity Nussbaum's *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context*, remains the only sustained critique of these texts. In it, she argues that attention to the *Nights* has focused on narrative and the prevalence of later adaptations based mostly on the orphan tales, but that the tropes that later become the marks of popular Orientalism, marking the Orient as "despotic, sensual, beautiful, dangerous, and wealthy beyond belief"[17] are actually established through these very texts, the Georgian popular theater adaptations of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In the plethora of popular adaptations of the *Nights* in the late Georgian period, the stories focusing on issues of governance have mostly disappeared from the repertoire, but the "orphan tales" of "Aladdin," "Ali Baba," and "The Voyages of Sindbad" have had the longest staying power in Anglo-American popular culture. As Orr points out, adaptations of these tales emphasize class mobility, featuring "rags-to-riches stories whose management of desire and class resentment remain under late capitalism as in its period of emergence."[18] With these arguments, Orr describes the paradox that underpins the longevity of the *Nights* on the stage: on the one hand, adaptations of the *Nights* created a vocabulary of visual exoticism that continues to define the Middle East and North Africa in Anglo-American popular

[17] Bridget Orr, "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and Popular Orientalism" in *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*, ed. Saree Makdisi and Felicity Nussbaum (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 129.

[18] Orr, "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and Popular Orientalism," 126.

culture; on the other, these narratives are aspirational in a way easily recognizable to Britain at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution. The dialectic appeal of popular Orientalism was rooted equally in sameness as in difference. I argue that late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century performance cultures and practices further impact the relational status between spectators, performers, and Oriental subjects, and that these texts embrace the cosmopolitan possibilities of empire.

Corporeality and Metatheatricality in Comedy

The depiction of sentiment is one of the defining characteristics of eighteenth-century adaptation on the stage. Comedy is an interesting counterpoint to tragedy because it works to narrow that distance with the audience and also increases sentiment but to different ends than tragedy. As discussed in the second chapter, eighteenth-century tragedy emphasized the distance between the actor and the character through metatheatricality, in order to create more space for the sympathetic exchange between actor, character, and spectator, a process compounded through the representation of the foreign onstage. In comedy, familiarity and distance are taken to the extreme: stock characters and situations became familiar through their repetition across a variety of plays for many years, a repetition that also makes it difficult to recognize characters as individual sympathizing subjects. Oliver Goldsmith's "Essay on the Theatre" shows that one response to this process was to create a new hybrid genre, the sentimental comedy, "in which the virtues of Private Life are exhibited, rather than the Vices exposed; and the Distresses, rather than the Faults of Mankind, make our interest in the piece."[19] Goldsmith's concern is that this "Bastard Tragedy" (in his words) is fundamentally not humorous, and that by replacing absurdity with distress that laughter will no longer have a place on the stage. Part of the problem is that sentimental comedy is the worst of two

[19] Oliver Goldsmith, "An Essay on the Theatre; or, A Comparison between Laughing and Sentimental Comedy," *Westminster Magazine* (January 1773) 5.

genres: the sober situations focus on feeling and emotion but lack the grandeur of tragedy's emotional stakes by focusing on the mundane. For Goldsmith, both comedy and tragedy's successes rely on different registers of alienation between the spectator and the characters: tragedy's power comes when "the Great excite our pity by their fall,"[20] not by identifying with the characters' feelings; comedy's comes from disidentifying enough from the distress or pain in recognizable situations in order to find humor in the absurdity.

In addition to the plays' *mise-en-scène*, the generic conventions of comedy are predicated on actively incorporating the audience in the stage action to an even greater extent. Asides, interpolated songs satirizing specifically London locales or mores, and the extended use of dramatic irony emphasize a conspiracy between the actors, characters, and audience against various points of satire, targets that did not necessarily connect logically or sequentially.[21] Metatheatricality increased the potential for sympathy, as theorized by the thinkers of the Scottish Enlightenment, in creating a greater number of sympathizing subjects by recognizing the distinct experiences of the character and the actor, rather than the identification and the elision of theatrical boundaries attempted by modern realist tragedy. Hume describes his understanding of the audience's experience of theatricality:

> It is certain, that, in the theatre, the representation has almost the effect of reality; yet it has not altogether that effect. However we may be hurried away by the spectacle; whatever dominion the senses and imagination may usurp over the reason, there still lurks at the bottom a certain idea of falsehood in the whole of what we see. This idea, though weak and disguised, suffices to diminish the pain which we suffer from the misfortunes of those

[20] Goldsmith, "An Essay on the Theatre," 5.

[21] David Mayer III, *Harlequin in His Element: The English Pantomime, 1806-1836* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969), 6.

> whom we love, and to reduce that affliction to such a pitch as converts it into a pleasure…This extraordinary effect proceeds from that very eloquence, with which the melancholy scene is represented…the exercise, I say, of these noble talents, together with the force of expression, and beauty of oratorial numbers, diffuse the highest satisfaction on the audience, and excite the most delightful movements. By this means, the uneasiness of the melancholy passions is not only overpowered and effaced by something stronger of an opposite kind; but the whole impulse of those passions is converted into pleasure, and swells the delight which the eloquence raises in us.[22]

At the same time that tragedy is not diminished by an awareness of its "falsehood", it is the awareness of fictionality that is at the heart of tragedy's power. If the spectator were to lose themselves completely in the emotion of tragedy, they would experience only sympathetic sorrow rather than simultaneously feeling the pleasure of the theater. The idea of illusion is a part of metatheatricality, but it involves the forced acknowledgment of the artifice inherent in dramatic and artistic endeavors. The pleasure of eloquence derives from feeling moved by the oratorical performance while the audience is simultaneously impressed by the actor's skill in creating feeling. It is not that the actors are credited with actually sharing feelings with their characters, but it is in the "seeming" and their ability to communicate where the enjoyment of the drama lies. While scholars have known this to be at the heart of the great tragedians' success, from Betterton and Barry through Siddons and Kemble, the rise of pantomime in the later end of the period with the success of Joseph Grimaldi suggests that a similar relationship exists between rhetorical eloquence and embodied comedic performance.

While metatheatricality focused on textual pathos in tragedy united with gesture, the popular theater had a "corporeal dramaturgy which privileged the galvanic, affective capacity of the human

[22] Hume, "Of Tragedy," 220.

body as a vehicle of dramatic expression."[23] In an essay predating the development of English pantomime, the *Tatler* describes the pleasure that can come solely from the incidents and gestures of tragedy, irrespective of the text, which anticipates the silent, kinesthetic appeal of pantomime:

> Yesterday we were entertain'd with the Tragedy of the Earl of Essex, in which there is not one good line, and yet a Play which was never seen without drawing Tears from some part of the Audience; a remarkable instance, that the Soul is not to be mov'd by Words, but Things; for the Incidents in this Drama are laid together so happily, that the Spectator makes the Play by Himself, by the Force which Circumstance has upon his Imagination.[24]

The mediocre language does not prevent the production of tears, creating a sympathetic exchange engineered between bodies. Oddly though, the body of the actor is removed from this scenario: the spectator makes the play, not the performers. A narrative is created using the vocabulary of movement and gesture provided onstage. Audiences are not just equal participants in theater-making; here, they are significant co-producers.

In fact, stage action is not mimetic in nature, but stylized in the mode of rhetoric, where specific gestures and attitudes corresponded to specific emotions: "Suitable to this vehemence of thought and expression, was the vehemence of action, observed in the ancient orators. The *supplosio pedis*, or stamping with the foot, was one of the most usual and moderate gestures which they made use of; though that is now esteemed too violent, either for the senate, bar, or pulpit, and is only admitted into the theatre, to accompany the most violent passions, which are there represented."[25] Certain gestures are not only expected on the stage, but they are expected to be found *only* on the stage.

---

[23] Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre*, 86.

[24] Richard Steele, No. 14 "Will's Coffee-house, May 11," in *The Tatler* (London: 1709).

[25] David Hume, "Of Eloquence," in *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1985), 101-2.

Hume's account of sympathy presents the passions as part of the body's involuntary functions, not as the product of individual expression. While Smith centers the mind in the creation of emotion, and thus emphasizes the role of projection in its spread, for Hume the emotions are produced via the body as machine: "In the production and conduct of the passions, there is a certain regular mechanism, which is susceptible of as accurate a disquisition, as the laws of motion, optics, hydrostatics, or any part of natural philosophy."[26] Hume in fact suggests that one cannot affect the spread of emotion, as involuntary as the circulatory system: "When by my will alone I can stop the blood, as it runs with impetuosity along its canals, then may I hope to change the course of my sentiments and passions."[27] If the body is a machine that works involuntarily, then, as contemporary theories of acting suggested, certain emotions could be produced and replicated in the body. This leads Denis Diderot in his provocative *La parodoxe sur le comédien* (written around 1773; published posthumously in 1830) to argue that the actor does not need to feel the emotions that they perform onstage.[28] Staged emotion is a display of artful, not authentic, feeling. Hazlitt echoes this feeling: "What brings the resemblance nearer is, that, as they imitate us, we, in our turn, imitate them."[29] But imitation is not restricted to the stage; audiences not only see their behavior reflected onstage but also imitate the performances they see there in life.

While we have considerable critical discussion of Georgian tragedy, comedy has been under-theorized in both eighteenth-century and modern aesthetic theory. In Aristotle's *Poetics*, comedy is "a mimesis of people worse than are found in the world—'worse' in the particular sense of 'uglier,' as the ridiculous is a species of ugliness; for what we find funny is a blunder that does no serious

---

[26] David Hume, *A Dissertation on the Passions* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007), 6:19.

[27] David Hume, "The Epicurian," in *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary* (Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1985), 140.

[28] Joseph Roach, *The Player's Passions: Studies in the Science of Acting* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), 117.

[29] William Hazlitt, "On Actors and Acting," *Examiner* (London: 5 January 1817).

damage or an ugliness that does not imply pain, the funny face, for instance, being one that is ugly and distorted, but not with pain."[30] Comedy is less interested in sympathetic exchange than tragedy (when Harlequin trips and falls, the audience should laugh, not feel his pain or embarrassment), and Henri Bergson characterizes laughter as produced by the "absence of feeling,"[31] meaning the lack of sympathy for the subject. But in the more physiological sense, feeling is central to eighteenth-century comedy. The comedy of pantomime erupts when the bodily machine is not fully under cognitive control, and when the action escapes the bounds of the plausible or the production of emotion transcends the appropriate.

Eighteenth-century philosophers use tragedy as evidence for their arguments about the nature of passions and sympathy outside of the theater, but rarely use examples from comedy. Smith and Hume elide the distinction between stage representation and lived experience in tragedy, suggesting that comedy is more readily seen as a metatheatrical genre. Shaftesbury argues that it took the ancients longer to perfect comedy than tragedy, because of the former's greater degree of difficulty.[32] Comedy serves as a necessary counterweight to the gravitas of tragedy: "this first-formed comedy and scheme of ludicrous wit was introduced upon the neck of the sublime. The familiar airy muse was privileged as a sort of counter-pedagogue against the pomp and formality of the more solemn writers."[33] While comic relief is a core tenet of early modern English tragedy, the formalization of epilogues as a part of all performances in the Restoration codified the practice. The generic mixing of the theater places comedic epilogues at the end of tragedy, often as the

---

[30] Aristotle, "Poetics," trans. M.E. Hubbard, in *Classical Literary Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 56.

[31] Henri Bergson, *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic* (New York: Macmillan, 1914), 4.

[32] Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, ed. Lawrence E. Klein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 109.

[33] Shaftesbury, *Characteristics*, 113.

heroine rises from dead so the actress may perform the epilogue, most famously when Nell Gwyn suddenly began speaking the comic epilogue as her character's corpse was being carried offstage in 1669.[34] From the first decade of the patent theaters, then, comedy is in part born out of metatheatrical interruption.

As Nell Gwyn's resurrection suggests, eighteenth-century comedy is often an inversion of the tragic. It shows how the modality of pantomime, to use Alenka Zupančič's term,[35] shifts a recognizably tragic topic into comedy.[36] Pantomime adapts both texts and tropes into the form, translating situations or settings into its silent, physical lexicon. For example, suicide is a common trope of eighteenth-century tragedy, and in *The Magic of Orosmanes* (1785), Harlequin, distressed by his enslavement, tries to kill himself, but as he mimes the various methods of suicide, he is dissuaded by his imaginings of the potential pain:

> Scene II. *The Gardens of the Seraglio.* The Eunuch conducts Harlequin and Clown, and after having described their separate employments, orders them to their work, and leaves them—Harlequin, after deploring his situation, determines to kill himself, and telling the Clown his intention, advises him to do the same—the Clown begs to be excused, but tells Harlequin he'll leave the coast clear rather than be witness to the death of his friend—this he does, after taking leave in a very comic manner. Harlequin, being now alone, considers how he had best dispatch himself—a pistol, a halter, and a phial of poison, appear to him by the hands of three statues, which rise on traps—Harlequin makes an obedience to them, and first

[34] Diana Solomon, *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theater: Gender and Comedy, Performance and Print* (Newark, NJ: University of Delaware Press, 2013), 1-2.

[35] Alenka Zupančič, *The Odd One In: On Comedy* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008), 102.

[36] For example, in *Antony and Cleopatra*, Mark Antony's servant Eros kills himself rather than help Antony suicide. Antony falls on his sword but does not die until after he reunites with Cleopatra: "Not Caesar's valour hath o'erthrown Antony, / But Antony's hath triumph'd on itself" (William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra* [New York: Washington Square Press, 1999], V.xv.14-15). Contrast with the Clown's escape from a suicide pact and Harlequin's fear of a pain, like Antony's drawn-out death.

> resolves to take the pistol, but upon considering it will make his head ach [sic], he rejects it—in like manner he refuses the poison, for fear of a pain in the stomach; and upon putting his hands round his throat to try the effects of strangling, he will have nothing to do with the halter—upon second thought, however, he plucks up resolution, and takes the pistol, when— *Orosmanes appears, attended by two Genii*[37]

While the tragic hero chooses suicide as a way out of an irreconcilable conflict, the Harlequin focuses on how the act of suicide would feel on the body. The setting of the pantomime is exoticized, and Harlequin looks to death to escape Oriental slavery. But the scene focuses on what would be familiar to an audience: the feeling of pain inflicted on the body.

This emphasis on visual signifiers crosses over from pantomime into tragic acting styles by the end of the period. Acting at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in part a response to the popularity of illegitimate theater genres, began to include even more gesture and poses from painting.[38] This metatheatricality can be seen in Richard Brinsley Sheridan and George Colman the Younger's *The Forty Thieves: A Grand Melo-Dramatic Romance* (1806), which incorporates specific tropes and characters of English theater into its Oriental fantasy. The poor woodcutter Ali Baba discovers the hideaway of a group of thieves and using their password "open sesame" takes back to his family some of their ill-gotten treasure.[39] His selfish brother attempts to do the same, but is killed when, having forgotten the password and trapped in the cave, he is discovered by the thieves. The thieves are determined to also murder Ali Baba, and they hide in forty perfume jars to surprise him in his

---

[37] Charles Dibdin, *The Magic of Orosmanes; or, Harlequin Slave and Sultan: A Pantomime, drawn from the Arabian Legends* (London: 1785), II, pg. 4-5.

[38] Frederick Burwick, "Georgian Theories of the Actor," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 186.

[39] In the second Gulf War, American soldiers referred to looters as "Ali Babas," collapsing any distinction between the hero and the thieves he opposes; see Shaila K. Dewan, "A Brush with 'Ali Baba' Reveals the Rule of Lawlessness," *The New York Times*, June 29, 2003, https://nyti.ms/2JAVUup.

home. They are discovered by Ali Baba's virtuous slave Morgiana, who pours hot oil into the jars, and later kills the king of thieves with his own knife. Sheridan and Colman create commonalities between the fantastical Orient and English cultural texts: the Oriental jinns supporting the thieves are opposed by Oberon and Titania-like fairies defending the virtuous Ali Baba, and Morgiana the slave transcends her station by marrying the master's son; thus her virtue is rewarded, like Samuel Richardson's Pamela, through class mobility. The fantasy that underlines both the supernatural support and poetic justice is as much domestic as it is foreign, adapting two different lexicons to create a utopic no-place.

In the climactic scene, Morgiana dances to distract the king of thieves from his plan to murder Ali Baba, ultimately frustrating the attempt by turning his dagger on himself. Her dance is a mixture of the exotic with more recognizably eighteenth-century English theatrical conventions:

> Morgiana dances with a tambourine, in which, imitating two or three of the passions, she prevents Hassarac's attempt to stab Ali Baba, without her intention being discovered—Hassarac at length lifts up his dagger, and is upon the point of assassinating him, when Morgiana seizes his arm, and, in the scuffle, forces the dagger into the breast of the robber, who falls and expires.[40]

Morgiana performs a play within a play, making the figures that represent different emotions (used in tragic acting of the period) as she distracts the prince of thieves from his assassination attempt. While *The Forty Thieves* is not a musical comedy rather than a pantomime—it is described alternatively as an "operatical romance" and a "melo-drama"—Morgiana's triumph is embodied through dance and mime, rather than appearing as text in dialogue or song. The dance both engages with and satirizes Hume's writing on eloquence: her performance includes the gestures that are

[40] Richard Brinsley Sheridan and George Colman the Younger, *The Forty Thieves: A Grand Romantic Drama* (London: Printed by J. Duncombe, 1806), II.viii pg. 38.

expected of theater, but her dance is also an imitation of performance that masks her main action. In *The Forty Thieves,* the body as spectacle is the heart of performance, but as such is not representative of nontheatrical feeling. Morgiana's performance is an imitation of an imitation: imitating the theatrical conventions of acting, allowing her to conceal her own motivations.

Harlequin embodies the juxtaposition between the familiar and the foreign that characterizes the London popular theater. The English pantomime tradition evolved from the *commedia dell'arte*, often via France, and retains many of the stock characters and structure, divided into the *zanni* or zany (the comic servants) of Harlequin/Arlecchino, his love Columbine/Colombina, and Clown or Pierrot, and the comedic semi-bourgeois antagonists Pantaloon/Pantalone and Doctor/Dottore. Scenes of physical comedy were improvised using *lazzi*, set pieces of physical comedy that could be initiated by an actor during a scenario and played through.[41]

John O'Brien argues that the Harlequin is a foreign figure, developed from the *commedia* in France and Italy, denoting otherness with his black mask,[42] but at the same time he is a figure of identification for audiences, "an emblem of the great body of the hungry common people, one sufficiently stylized to place his association with the masses at a safe remove, but sufficiently convincing to mobilize the theater's capacity for direct engagement with the spectator."[43] Much of

---

[41] For more on the Italian *commedia* and its influence on eighteenth-century English popular theater, see Gerald Frow, *"Oh, Yes it is!" A History of Pantomime* (London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1985), 7-62; John O'Brien, *Harlequin Britain: Pantomime and Entertainment, 1690-1760* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004); Richard Semmens, *Studies in English Pantomime, 1712-1733* (Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2016); Jennifer Thorp, "From Scaramouche to Harlequin: Dances 'in grotesque characters' on the London Stage," in *The Lively Arts of the London Stage, 1675-1725*, ed. Kathryn Lowerre (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014), 113-27; and Matthew R. Wilson, "Speechless spectacles: Commedia pantomime in France, England, and the Americas during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries," in *The Routledge Companion to Commedia dell'Arte*, eds. Judith Chaffee and Olly Crick (New York: Routledge, 2015), 355-63.

[42] The history of Harlequin's black mask is uncertain and complex (see O'Brien, *Harlequin Britain*, 117-37). James Powell's *Furibond; Or, Harlequin Negro* (1807) suggests that Harlequin's black mask alone would not necessarily signal Blackness, as minstrel blackface would later in the United States, but was easily adapted to the depiction of Africans; see David Worrall, *Theatric Revolution: Drama, Censorship and Romantic Period Subcultures, 1773-1832* (Oxford: Oxford University Pres, 2006) 289-309.

[43] O'Brien, *Harlequin Britain*, 58.

Harlequin's action is motivated by the animal passions shared by audiences of all classes: hunger, greed, lust. Situations that in tragedy are elevated by the performance of sentiment become comedic when placed in a corporeal register. While fine feeling may not be within every spectator's experiences, the shared needs and desires of the body provide a focus for collective laughter.

Two pantomimes that directly draw on material from the *Nights*, Charles Dibdin's *The Magic of Orosmanes; or, Harlequin Slave and Sultan: a Pantomime, drawn from the Arabian Legends* (1785) and *The Valley of Diamonds; or, Harlequin Sinbad* (1814), follow a similar pattern to other pantomimes: the source provides the initial setting, Harlequin appears or is transformed from the lead, and various stock scenes follow of mute physical comedy, until finally Harlequin succeeds in his quest for riches and/or love and is returned to his original form. The Harlequin transformation scene, until the ascendance of Joseph Grimaldi's performances as the Clown,[44] was a defining characteristic of English pantomime.[45] *The Magic of Orosmanes* is loosely based on the Second Calender's Tale, who is turned into an ape after sleeping with a woman imprisoned by a jinni. Orosmanes reveals to Harlequin that he is his son Achmet, turned into an ape by the sorcerer Octar, in order for the sorcerer's son to marry Achmet's intended Zulma. Orosmanes' magic is only able to transform him into Harlequin from the animal. While the riches of the Orient offered a space of possibility in eighteenth-century commodity culture, for the seamen it also suggested the very real threat of slavery and captivity:[46] the comedy of *Harlequin Slave and Sultan* plays on this tension.[47] *The Valley of*

---

[44] Grimaldi's Clown emphasized child-like perception with a costume that lacked specific referents, unlike the Italian working-class Arlecchino. During the Napoleonic Wars, the Clown became even more disassociated with the Continent, becoming synonymous with John Bull. See Andrew McConnell Stott, *The Pantomime Life of Joseph Grimaldi: Laughter, Madness and the Story of Britain's Greatest Comedian* (Edinburgh: Canongate Books, 2009), 95-101, 126.

[45] Worrall, *Harlequin Empire*, 140.

[46] See Linda Colley, *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1660-1850* (New York: Pantheon, 2002).

[47] Bridget Orr, "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and the Creation of Popular Orientalism," in *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*, ed. Saree Makdisi and Felicity Nussbaum (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008), 125.

the Diamonds comes from the second voyage of Sinbad with the appearance of the roc, the story that Srinivas Aravamudan has argued influenced the second book of *Gulliver's Travels*.[48] In both pantomimes, Harlequin is given a magic sword that will aide him on his journey. Sinbad's discovery of the sword initiates his transformation into Harlequin. These magical transformations occur onstage, but neither the Larpent manuscripts nor the published texts indicate how that was accomplished.

The staging, however, does not depict a consistently exoticized Orient; rather, the Harlequinade characters jump through time and space between a fantastical East and the quotidian London. Both *The Magic of Orosmanes* and *The Valley of Diamonds* feature pantomimed scenes set in Covent Garden and the Haymarket, as, in the former for example, Oriental villains chase Harlequin, his love Zulma, and Clown. The boundaries between an English market and an Oriental harem are elided. The London scene is not one that directly corresponds to the harem (say, the court or the closet) but a place that specializes in fulfilling the appetites: a food market, a place of prostitution, and a theater neighborhood. Pantomime's reliance on lazzi (or stock jokes) within stock scenarios contributes to the indigenizing[49] of the Oriental texts. Like the transformation, the rapid scene shifts are part of pantomime's overall emphasis on speed, moving the audience along in addition to moving their emotions.[50] This pace forecloses the possibility of strict separations between the

---

[48] Srinivas Aravamudan, *Enlightenment Orientalism: Resisting the Rise of the Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 143. Scholars remain divided on the relationship between *Gulliver's Travels* and the *Nights*. Aravamudan cites the similarities between "Sinbad," published separately by Galland before being included in the *Nights* cycle, and Gulliver's escape from Brobdingnag. Sheila Shaw, however, denies any connection between Gulliver's sexual encounter with the Maids of Honor and the story "Hassân-al-Bassri," which does not appear in the Galland and in fact does not appear in the *Nights* sequence until the nineteenth century. See Sheila Shaw, "The Rape of Gulliver: Case Study of a Source," *PMLA* 90, no. 1 (1975): 62-68. It is also worth noting that Clara Reeve, in *The Progress of Romance* (1785), connects the story of Sinbad to Homer's *Odyssey,* placing the *Arabian Nights* in an intertextual landscape in the period.

[49] Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 148-53.

[50] Melynda Nuss, *Distance, Theatre, and the Public Voice, 1750-1850* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 16.

London metropolis and the Orient, troubling any established markers of difference in the metropolis.

The Metropolis of Aladdin and the Little Hunchback

As an Irish Catholic working in London theater, playwright John O'Keeffe can be read as one of those urban figures of difference. His adaptations of the *Nights* as afterpieces during the 1780s similarly emphasize commonality over difference in the relationship between London and the Orient. *The Dead Alive* (1781), *Aladdin* (1788), and *The Little Hunch-back* (1789) each more drastically urbanizes its source, overlapping the exoticism of the tales with a recognizable metropolitan landscape. *Aladdin* and *The Little Hunch-back* in particular dramatize the tension between the presumed safety and coherence of nativism and the possibilities offered by a more cosmopolitan worldview, the latter represented by O'Keeffe's own position.

O'Keeffe's adaptation *Aladin [sic], or the Wonderful Lamp* only survives through a publication of its song lyrics.[51] The play's score[52] also remains, written by William Shield, the principal violist and composer for Covent Garden, and later the Master of the King's Musick (roughly equivalent to the position of Poet Laureate). *Aladdin* intersperses the recitative that describes the Oriental story, but it is interspersed with comedic songs by archetypical working-class characters that emphasize their own Englishness. While much of the humor in the play itself is a part of a broader cosmopolitan literary and theatrical culture, a pantomime adaptation of a tale from a translated French edition of a collection of Eastern tales.

---

[51] John O'Keeffe, *The Recitatives, Airs, Choruses, &c. in Aladin [sic]; or, The Wonderful Lamp. A Pantomime Entertainment. Performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden. Music composed by Mr. Shield. Second Edition* (London: Printed for T. Cadell, in the Strand, 1788). All subsequent citations are in the text.

[52] *The Pantomime of Aladin, or the Wonderful Lamp; as perform'd with universal applause at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden: the Poetry by J. O'Keefe Esq. the Music selected from the Works of Handel, Giordini, Gluck, Carolan, & Shield, by Mr. A Shaw, the Songs by W. Shield* (London: Printed for G. Goulding, Haydn's Head, No. 6 James Street, Covent Garden, and No. 113 Bishopgate Street, n.d).

Aladdin first appeared as an afterpiece to William Congreve's *The Mourning Bride* (1697), and the cast list shows the traditional pantomime characters of Harlequin, Pantaloon, Taberino, Pierrot, and Columbine instead of any specific character names (except the credit for Aladdin's Mother), in contrast to the characters in O'Keeffe's *Dead Alive* and *The Little Hunch-back*, suggesting that the play used the *Nights* setting with Harlequinade stock characters and thus would have more in common with the *Nights* pantomimes previously discussed. The casting of Thomas Boyce, a Sadler Wells dancer, also suggests that *Aladdin* was a pantomime, unlike O'Keeffe's other *Nights* afterpieces with surviving scripts. As in present-day Aladdin pantomimes,[53] this foregrounds the generic expectations of pantomime instead of the narrative specificity of this adaptation. While difficult to hypothesize with the limited information available, the character list also suggests that the individual actors could be highlighted over the characters they play, given the practice of actors taking on stock roles and character types in the repertoire.

The songs include recitatives that set up the Oriental scene, along with humorous songs depicting London types and mores, collapsing the difference between the Orient and the metropolis.[54] While the recitatives and airs help the plot of the tale progress, many of the extended songs bear little relationship to the pantomime's setting and derive their humor and effect from jokes and references specific to London, like the Coachmaker's Song:

> My post-chaise is the thing for an amorous pair
>
> That round Hampstead trip for a mouthful of air,
>
> Should they find it too sharp, why they may on occasion,

---

[53] For more on contemporary British pantomime, see Frow, *"Oh, Yes it is!" A History of Pantomime*; and Karl Sabbagh, "The *Arabian Nights* in British Pantomime," in *Scheherazade's Children: Scheherazade's Children: Global Encounters with the Arabian Nights*, eds. Philip F. Kennedy and Marina Warner (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 269.

[54] Berta Joncus, "'Nectar If You Taste and Go, Poison If You Stay': Struggling with the Orient in Eighteenth-Century British Musical Theater," in *Scheherazade's Children: Scheherazade's Children: Global Encounters with the Arabian Nights*, eds. Philip F. Kennedy and Marina Warner (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 283.

Just draw up the blinds for mere conversation.

The Cit on a Saturday tir'd of his shop,

For villa at Hammersmith harnesses Crop,

Cries, "Deary, we'll stay in the country till Monday,

In the seat of the whisky put dinner for Sunday." (II.vii, pg. 14)

The sexual joke relies in part on an understanding of greater London: Hampstead on the outskirts of the city functioned as a space for both a simple rural escape and illicit sexual assignations. While Orientalism describes a generalist approach to setting, the comedic songs are satirizing particular London types and tropes. These different modes are most often read in contrast to one another, but I suggest that these distinctions could also be collapsed in its performance, that there is no firm demarcation between the local specificity of the Coachmaker's Song and the exoticism of the story of Aladdin.

The resounding Englishness (and Londonish) songs stand in tension with the main narrative from the *Nights*, where the materiality of trade described in the Potter's Song contradicts the play's own conditions of literary production:

And why abroad our money fling,

To please our fickle fair?

No more from China, China bring,

Here's English China-ware.

Then friends put round the foaming mug,

And take it with good will;

Since man is but an earthen jug,

This jug then let us fill.

And how can he, (ye wise ones,) pray,

Return to dust, who wets his clay? (I.xiii, pg. 12)

The Potter's Song claims a position antithetical to what the play actually accomplishes, describing an insular economic policy of English products over global imports. The material conditions of the play belie the surface-level message of the song, creating the potential for an ironic reading of this nativism. O'Keeffe's own status as an imperial "import," as an Irish Catholic settled in London, undermines the song's Anglophilia. Moreover, O'Keeffe's Irishness and the *Arabian Nights*' Gallicism points to England's immediate borderlands even as the narrative depicts a distant imaginary place. The potential for continuity between spectator and character then here is undermined: for the non-English in the audience (certainly the Irish and Scots, and other ethnic groups in addition as the demographics of London shifted), there would be a moment of dissonance where both the foreign (Oriental) and the domestic (English) onstage would be alienating; for the English, that identification would be troubled by the text's own hybridity, openly declared both by the setting and O'Keeffe's name.[55]

The implicit irony in the comedic songs of *Aladdin*, aspiring to isolationism in a city run on global trade, becomes the narrative focus of O'Keeffe's *The Little Hunch-back; or, A Frolic in Bagdad* [sic] (1789). While the text retains the setting of its title rather than moving the action to contemporary London (as happens in *The Dead Alive*), the city it depicts centers on a specifically urban yet tenuous religious pluralism. "The Story of the Little Hunch-back" is the largest set of related stories in the *Nights*, as the hunchback's supposed death and the repeated attempts of others to avoid culpability engender eleven interpolated tales within the main narrative. In it, the sultan's favorite, a small hunchback man, leaves the court and performs in the streets of Baghdad:

[55] For more on O'Keeffe's Irishness in international context, see Helen M. Burke, "The Revolutionary Prelude: The Dublin Stage in the Late 1770s and Early 1780s," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 22, no. 3 (1998): 7-16 and Burke, "The Catholic Question, Print Media, and John O'Keeffe's *The Poor Soldier* (1783)," *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 27, no. 3-4 (2015): 419-48.

> One day as he sat at work, a little hunch-back my lord came and sat down at the shop-door, and fell a-singing, at the same time played upon the tabor. The taylor took pleasure to hear him, and had a strong mind to take him into his house to make his wife merry: this little fellow, says he to his wife, will divert us both very agreeably. In fine, he invited my lord in, and he readily accepted the invitation; so the taylor shut up his shop and carried him home.[56]

The hunchback is invited back to a tailor's house for dinner, where he chokes on a fish bone. Fearing that he and his wife will be accused as murderers, they leave and bring the corpse to the Jewish physician, saying that they have a sick man. While the maid delivers the news, they leave the hunchback and flee. The Jewish doctor then believes the hunchback died on his doorstep. He and his wife drop the hunchback's corpse down the chimney of the sultan's purveyor, who beats the body with a cane believing it to be a thief. Realizing he has killed the sultan's favorite, he places the body at the end of the street, and walks away. At dawn, a Christian merchant stumbles upon the body while drunk, and attacks it thinking it to be a robber. The watch hears and accuses the Christian of assassinating a Muslim.

Seeing the merchant brought to the gallows, the purveyor is overcome by guilt and offers himself up as the true murderer, as the physician and tailor also do in turn. Confounded by this tale, the tailor, the physician, the purveyor, the merchant, and the body of the hunchback are brought to the sultan:

> When they appeared before the sultan, the judge threw himself at the prince's feet; and, after recovering himself, gave him a faithful relation of what he knew of the story of the crump-backed man. The sultan found the story so uncommon, that he ordered his private historians to write it with its circumstances. Then, addressing himself to all the audience, Did you ever

[56] *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*, ed. Robert L. Mack (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 222-23. All subsequent quotations cited in text.

> hear, said he, such a surprising story as this, that has happened upon the account of my little crooked buffoon? Then the Christian merchant, after falling down and saluting the earth with his forehead, spoke in the following manner: Most puissant monarch, said he, I know a story yet more astonishing than that you have now spoke of; if your majesty will give me leave, I will tell it you: The circumstances are such, that nobody can hear them without being moved. Well, said the sultan, I give you leave; and so the merchant went on as follows… (*ANE* 228)

As befitting the longest stand-alone story cycle, the stories are told as a way to save the lives of all four tradesmen embroiled in the hunchback's death. Each tells his own story, attempting to outdo the story they themselves are actors in. The tailor's story includes a mysterious barber, who caused a client to go lame, and he then continues with the stories of each of the barber's six brothers. The barber is brought to the court and told the story of the hunchback. Examining the body, he sees that the hunchback is not yet dead. He removes the fishbone from the throat, and "immediately Hump-back sneezed, stretched forth his arms and feet, and gave several other signs of life" (*ANE* 305).

This tale is perhaps uniquely suited for the eighteenth-century London stage because of how the tale imagines urban space. "The Story of the Little Hunch-back" presents the landscape of the merchant class. Here, Baghdad is cosmopolitan, with Christians, Jews, and Muslims coexisting in the proto-bourgeoisie, and only threatened when brought into contact with an absolutist court. O'Keeffe's Baghdad is a familiar space, with the sentimental lovers and ethnic humor of much London-set comedy, though the punishments that provide the conflict that drives the plot were more associated with Ottoman rule. While the play's subtitle emphasizes the exotic location, the play itself is not an Orientalist fantasy but rather features the Christian-Jewish-Muslim heterogeneity from the tale. In the tale, each religious adherent is self-serving and selfless in equal measures: trying

to avoid blame for the hunchback's death but confessing when it appears another will die for their crime. Religion is a part of their character descriptions, but that religious difference does not show a corresponding difference in morality. In the second half of the eighteenth century, English law began to reckon with the idea of non-Anglican participation in the public sphere,[57] and O'Keeffe's comedic depiction of urban religious diversity resonates with contemporary discussions around religious tolerance. Complicating the play's participating in Orientalism is O'Keeffe's inclusion of English seamen, showing a Baghdad that does not just serve as a metaphor for English culture or government, but a specific location that exists in relation to British subjects—a relationship that, as Orr argues, evokes contemporary British interactions with India more than medieval cultural encounters.[58]

The conventions of farce, particularly the emphasis on dramatic irony, emphasize continuity between spectator and character. In *The Little Hunch-back*, we know the hunchback Crumpy is faking his death from the beginning, while the final removal of the fish bone truly saves the life of his counterpart in the *Nights*. Unlike the *Nights*' passive corpse, Crumpy orchestrates most of farce's action. He interacts directly with the audience, creating an alliance between the London audience and this Muslim character. The performance record shows how this would have been even more evident in performance: *The Little Hunch-back* was written to serve as a benefit for John Quick, who played Crumpy the Hunchback. Quick also gave the prologue to the mainpiece, Richard Brinsley

[57] While only members of the Church of England could vote, own property, or attend the universities for this period, there were substantial attempts aimed at lessening restrictions for non-Anglicans, with varying levels of success, including the Jewish Naturalization Act of 1753 (which was repealed the following year) and the "Papists Acts" of 1778 (prompting following Gordon Riots). Full reform was not achieved until the 1830s.

[58] Orr, "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and the Creation of Popular Orientalism," 122. In some pantomimes and melodramas, set and costume designers may have taken aesthetics from British travel and military writing based in recent North African activities; see Wallace Cable Brown, "The Near East in English Drama, 1775-1825," *The Journal of English and German Philology* 46, no. 1 (1947): 66.

Sheridan's *The Rivals* (1775). Throughout the performance, even before the beginning of the afterpiece, Quick/Crumpy was the audience's main interlocutor.

The comic conceit is that the sultan has passed a law that says non-Muslims will be caned for offending a Muslim, and executed for killing a Muslim even accidentally, and so Crumpy feigns death as a prank on his Christian drinking companions. While the play emphasizes the effect it has on the Christians, *The Little Hunch-back* evokes its source's vision of a pluralistic urban landscape, where religious oppression is the deviation rather than the norm: "What the devil's the matter with all the Christians and Jews I meet in the street? I frighten them away, as if I was some hob-goblin! Even the pretty girls trip from me, that us'd to take such pleasure in list'ning to my guitar, laughing at my jokes, and throwing up their veils to cast languishing ogles on my comely person."[59] The law gets in the way of Crumpy's performances and flirtations. The starring role is the Muslim hunchback, who maintains a strong connection with the audience. At dinner with the Christian tailor Cross-Leg and Juggy, Crumpy signals to the audience that he will use this new oppressive law to play an extended joke:

> Cross-Leg. Aye, now you talk of us Christians, Mr. Crumpy, as you are such a great man at court, if you'd only use your interest to get this cruel new law against us repeal'd—
>
> Crumpy. New law, what! Oh! true the proclamation. Oh! oh! Now I have it. (aside)
>
> Jug. Sir, that's what made my good man at first so much afraid of asking you in.
>
> Cross-Leg. For, Sir, if you should, which is impossible, be affronted, or receive the smallest hurt under this poor Christian roof, what wou'd become of me and my dear orthodox spousy?
>
> Crumpy. Eh! This promises a joke (aside)

[59] John O'Keeffe, *The Little Hunch-back; or, a Frolic in Bagdad* (London: Printed for J. Debrett, 1789), II.i, pg. 16. All subsequent quotations cited in text.

Cross-Leg. This fish is very sweet, but it has a great many bones!

Crumpy. Bones; a good hint (aside) —and so you were afraid if any thing should happen to me in your house, 'twould bring you into the clutches of the Cadi, and his bailiffs and terrible catchpoles (eats greedily)

Jug. That we were, Sir.

Crumpy. As you say, this fish is very sweet, but it has a damn'd deal of bones indeed; and as I have a curs'd narrow swallow—Egad! I must take care—

Jug. Pray do, Sir; but don't spoil your meal.

Cross-Leg. I was saying, Sir, this severity to us is rather hard; for, was I the Bassa of Bagdad

(Crumpy eating greedily, throws himself into violent contortion, stares and gapes)

Jug. You see how you get yourself laugh'd at, with your Beglarbegs and Bashaw, you noodle (to Cross-Leg.

Cross-Leg. Now, Sir, am I a noodle?

Crumpy. Cluck!—Cluck!—

(grimaces, and points to his throat)

Cross-Leg. Ay, Sir, laugh; for ha! ha! ha! I can't help laughing at it myself, ha! ha! ha! And yet, Sir, if you look into history, as unlikely things have happen'd. (II.ii, pg. 23)

This dialogue references a new law that oppresses Christians, but the scene focuses on the physical comedy, as Cross-Leg and Juggy continue to laugh at Crumpy's increasingly grotesque choking. As befitting a benefit piece for a comedic actor, the quotidian dialogue is overshadowed by the virtuosic antics of Quick. While this injustice drives the plot, in this scene the audience is aligned with the Muslim character who is using this law against the Christians, confusing the objects of sympathy and of satire. As in *Aladdin*, the point of identification is obscured. As a Western adaptation of an

Eastern text, *The Little Hunch-back* emphasizes the points of difference between its characters and settings and the people and place of its performance.

The play's subplot, original to the adaptation, doubles down on this vision of an England defined by difference. A pair of young lovers, the Jewish Absalom and the Christian Dora, have been forbidden by their guardians to marry and must turn to their wider urban network for help:

> Cross-Leg. So, because your Uncle won't have you marry the daughter of a Christian, and your step-father won't let you have the son of a Jew, you must both starve poor things! You shan't this night, however, for a wedding supper you shall have, though I pawn my goose for the price of it. Heark'ee—hasn't Father Anselm, the Armenian Friar promised to marry you. (I.i, pg. 3)

The interreligious aspect of the union is treated as an irrational impediment rather than the basis for a true crisis of faith, and the variously religiously-affiliated characters mark difference as the norm in this city, diversifying the demographics of this staged Baghdad: Dora's step-father is a French doctor, both allowing for accent-based anti-French jokes and distancing Dora from Mediterranean Catholicism; the Armenian priest, presumably Eastern Orthodox, stands as a neutral religious ground for the lovers. Absalom and Dora seek to sail for England, where they believe they can live together in peace. *The Little Hunch-back*, then, positions its real place of performance as the ideal fictional place of religious difference for the characters onstage.[60]

The comedic ending brings a restoration of order that celebrates Baghdad's religious diversity. Crumpy ends the play with this pluralistic monarchical vision, expanded from the source text's more ambivalent resolution:

[60] For more on British depictions of interfaith marriage, see Heather McNeff, "Finding Happiness: Interfaith Marriage in British Literature, 1745-1836" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2013).

Crumpy. I grant you shou'd—Christian, Turks, Jews, my seeming death has prov'd my kind master wou'd mourn my worthless life! And when I cease to wish my Prince may live long and merrily, may I be choak'd with a whalebone.

All noble chops in princely Bagdad,

Have often my poor frolicks wag'd at;

Still your's the laugh, and mine the thump,

So you're still pleas'd with Little Crump (II.vi, pg. 35)

The conflict in the *Nights'* "Hunchback" is based on the sultan's illogical and misplaced violence, where the punishment for a person's accidental death can be superseded by a better story (the hunchback performer valued only for the entertainment he provides in life and seeming death). In its adaptation, this arbitrariness becomes a mark of sentiment—the sultan is motivated by his grief at the death of a servant. Adaptation once again increases the display of sentiment, but instead of heightening the artificiality of the stage (as in the Oriental tragedy) it emphasizes continuity across both ethnic and class lines. The privileging of feeling crosses both the geographic differences between the setting and the performance space and the differences ascending the social ladder.

It is possible to make too much of *The Little Hunch-Back*'s pluralism, as Absalom converts to Christianity, foreclosing the possibility of interreligious marriage as well as eliminating the threat that these alternative religions may be preferable to a Protestant Christianity. But while the play contains negative Oriental, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic images, the text also destabilizes the place of morality or lack thereof in this setting. With that the point of audience identification[61] is continuously shifting, dramatizing an urban diversity that cannot remain strictly separate from England itself. O'Keeffe, an Irish Catholic playwright in London, creates space for both ethnic and religious difference in his Oriental metropolis. Adaptations of the *Nights* on the popular stage

[61] Orr, "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and the Creation of Popular Orientalism," 121.

celebrate the social inclusion of the urban landscape. The generic and geographic slippages in these adaptations present border crossings as places of possibility, rather than sources of anxiety as so often emphasized by critics when reading with an Orientalism lens. As British imperial ambitions intensified later in the nineteenth century, the points of difference between the metropole and the colonies were emphasized, but these texts show a metropolis based on diversity as much as isolation. If eighteenth- and nineteenth-century thinkers and audiences were unsure if bodies could control the spread of emotion from one subject to the next, the *Nights* on the popular stage embrace the positive potentials of that mixing.

Coda

Adaptation and the Imperial Century

The lines between the legitimate and illegitimate stages had already blurred by the 1830s.[1] Just as specific legal measures shaped theater practice in the Restoration and early eighteenth century, major legislation in the nineteenth century reinvented London's theatrical culture. In the early years of the century, as London expanded, so too did the number of minor theaters across the city. Such expansion also made the patent theaters more inaccessible to the average playgoer. Seeking to expand their repertory options, managers of the minor theaters began to put pressure on the generic restrictions placed by the Licensing Act, buoyed by the "tide of reformist enthusiasm" in the elections of 1831.[2] The first attempt at redress was the Select Committee on Dramatic Literature, led by Edward Bulwer-Lytton, which published its report in 1832. The report advocated abolishing the patent theater monopoly on spoken drama, and though it failed to pass due to opposition in the House of Lords it articulated the main ideological concerns on all sides of the debate that would result in the later successful Theatres Act.

The division between the legitimate and illegitimate stage was ostensibly based predominantly on genre, and the Select Committee report features interviews from a various playwrights, managers, and other professionals as they attempt to litigate dramatic form. In one attempt to distinguish the two forms, playwright Douglas Jerrold described the legitimate drama "to be where the interest of the piece is rather mental than physical."[3] Jerrold's definition speaks to both the basic principle underlying the split, but also to the impossibility of maintaining it. The illegitimate

---

[1] Jane Moody, *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 45-46.

[2] Katherine Newey, "The 1832 Select Committee," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, eds. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 145.

[3] *Report from the Select Committee on Dramatic Literature: With the Minutes of Evidence* (London: House of Commons, 2 August 1832), 158.

theater genres of pantomime, burletta, and melodrama all incorporated music and dancing in some capacity, and many emphasized physical comedy, centering the appreciation of the body's capabilities rather than the mental pleasure derived from language in spoken drama. But the legitimate theaters were similarly invested in the physical. As I have shown, the success of tragedy (the highest form of drama) was predicated on the successful creation of sympathetic responses. In the eighteenth century, sympathy was as much physiological as it was imaginative, and so legitimate drama equally interested in the physical as the illegitimate stage despite later attempts to bifurcate the locations of sympathetic exchange. But as science and medicine became fully professionalized, and discourses that encouraged ambiguity like Humean sympathy fell out in favor.

A decade later, the royal patent theater monopoly on spoken drama was ended by the Theatres Regulation Act of 1843. While seemingly freeing the London stages to perform any genre, it ultimately affirmed the conservative leanings in the early nineteenth-century culture wars.[4] The Act accomplished four main things: it repealed and replaced old legislation from various parliaments dating back to the reign of James I; it ended the illegitimate stage, bringing all theater licensing into state control; it expanded censorship to include all performances of spoken drama, opening previously exempt theaters to censorship; finally, it reaffirmed the elevated status of Shakespeare by continuing to restrict the performance of his plays, including adaptations, to the royal patent theaters.[5] Arguably, the end of the patent theater monopoly also ended the illegitimate theaters' relative freedom, bringing a greater share of dramatic performance across the city under the scrutiny of the government. Theater censorship in Britain would not end until 1968.

[4] Jacky Bratton, *New Readings in Theatre History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 3-93.
[5] Jim Davis, "Looking Towards 1843 and the End of Monopoly," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, eds. Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 158-60.

While in many ways the theater debates of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were London-centric, the parliamentary debates around the Theatres Act touch on the ways that Britain's imperial expansion at the time made theater regulation a geopolitical concern. The Marquess of Clanricarde, a Whip MP arguing for a limit to the Lord Chamberlain's censorship power, described the global reach of London performance:

> As to the entertainments, in every other respect, he considered they would be left entirely to the manager's discretion, it being no part of the Lord Chamberlain's duty to say, whether they should be drama, regular or irregular, or singing or dancing; whether the performers should be from the west or from the east, whether the language should be English, Irish, Iroquois, or Italian.[6]

In imagining the future repertoire of the London stage, Clanricarde seamlessly moves from forms to performers, a conflation encouraged by the association of genre with national character in the eighteenth century. As this quote suggests, empire was both figuratively and literally performed on the London stage. This project ends just as the ambiguity it argues for in eighteenth-century depictions of the Orient becomes less feasible with Britain's "imperial century,"[7] beginning with the territorial gains from the Congress of Vienna at the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 until the beginning of World War I in 1914. Eighteenth-century Britain's position as one of many empires, both European and Asian, that led to a more ambivalent relationship with empire ended as the British Empire achieved a monopoly, reaching unequaled levels of global dominance. At its peak at the beginning of the twentieth century, the empire "on which the sun never set" included almost a quarter of the world's population and a quarter of the Earth's land area. European colonial

---

[6] Ulick de Burgh, Marquess of Clanricarde, *Theatres Regulation Bill* (London: House of Lords, 14 August 1843), 588-9.

[7] See Ronald Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion* (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1976).

hegemony has made it difficult to read relationships between Europe and the rest of the world as anything other than as between the former's dominance over the latter. The relationship between metropole and colony coalesced around difference, foreclosing many opportunities for sympathetic connection across cultures. While eighteenth-century empire, especially as the height of the transatlantic slave trade, was in no way more benign than later iterations, this eventual dominance was not clear in earlier periods, nor was it the inevitable historical outcome.

Britain justified the imperial project by arguing that its colonial domination was due to its cultural and physiological superiority, coming out of the seismic shift in term "adaptation" itself in the nineteenth century. As its use in reference to literary and artistic creations became more common, the concept would take on radically new connotations with the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Order of Species* in 1859. The *Order of Species* would inspire the eugenics work of Darwin's cousin Francis Galton, where what would later become known as the theory of evolution was applied to human racial groups as well as species. Just as this new vision of adaptation was applied to forms of bodies, Darwin's theories impacted aesthetic form: "How have all those exquisite adaptations of one part of the organisation to another part, and to the conditions of life, and of one distinct organic being to another being, been perfected?"[8] The timing of this improvement was gradual but progressive, and by extension gives artistic adaptation temporality. The idea that adaptation is also development is implicit in much of contemporary adaptation studies, where the still dominant focus on older literary texts adapted into film takes this progressive orientation for granted.[9] Recognizing the impact of Darwinian adaptation is crucial to the project of historicizing adaptation theory by troubling technological determinism.

---

[8] Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species*, ed. Gillian Beer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 51.

[9] In the classroom students often talk about film and television adaptations in evolutionary terms, where classic narratives are adapted to newer technologies. I have to remind them that natural selection does not apply to art,

I end with the cultural turn at the beginning of the nineteenth century towards categorization that affected each of the main theoretical axes in this project: adaptation, drama, feeling, and imperialism. While I am not arguing for a causal relationship between these disparate processes, I do think they signal a common turn towards codification and away from ambiguity as movements begun in the eighteenth century normalized in the nineteenth. In historicizing eighteenth-century adaptation and Orientalism, aesthetic and political assumptions that have calcified are destabilized, showing them to be culturally specific to the present and thus not innate. *Furbish'd Remnants* argues that theories of emotion shaped both eighteenth-century adaptation and empire, as contemporary anxieties around the potential failure of the theater to create authentic English feeling magnified the affective tension between promise and threat offered Britain's unprecedented imperial expansion

since older forms such as drama, music, and poetry continue to coexist with later developments like film and photography.

WORKS CITED

Primary Sources

Arabian Nights Entertainments: Consisting of One Thousand and One Stories, Told by the Sultaness of the Indies, to Divert the Sultan from the Execution of a Bloody Vow...continuing a Better Account of the Customs, Manners, and Religion of the Eastern Nations, Viz: Tartars, Persians, and Indians, than Is to Be Met with [in] Any Author Hirtherto Published. Translated into French from the Arabian MSS. by M. Galland, and Now Done into English from the Third Edition in French... 2nd ed. 6 vols. London: Printed for Andrew Bell, 1712.

Arabian Nights to Which Is Added a Continuation of the Arabian Nights' Entertainments. Vol. 2. Liverpool: Nuttal & Fischer, 1814.

Arabian Nights Translated into French from the Arabian Mss, by M. Galland and Now Done into English from the Last Paris Edition. London, 1736.

Aristotle. "Poetics." In *Classical Literary Criticism*, 51–90. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Ayscough, George. *Semiramis, a Tragedy: As It Is Acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury-Lane*. London: Printed for J. Dodsley, in Pall-Mall., 1776.

Beaumont, G.S., trans. *Arabian Nights' Entertainments: Or, the Thousand and One Nights. Tr. from the Fr. of M. Galland by G.S. Beaumont*. London: Mathews & Leigh, 1811.

Behn, Aphra. "Essay on Translated Prose, Preface to A Discovery of New Worlds: From the French, Made English by Mrs. A Behn, by M. de Fontenelle." In *Seneca Unmasqued and Other Prose Translations: The Works of Aphra Behn*, edited by Janet Todd, 4:77. London: Pickering & Chatto, 1993.

Burgh, Ulick de 1st Marquess of Clanricarde. Theatres Regulation Bill, Pub. L. No. 71, 588 (London: House of Lords, 1843).

Burton, Roger. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. New York: New York Review of Books, 2001.

Cervantes, Miguel de. *Novellas Exemplares: Or, Exemplary Novels, in Six Books. Viz 1. The Two Damsels. 2. Lady Cornel. Bentivoglio. 3. The Generous Lover. 4. The Force of Blood. 5. The Spanish Lady. 6. The Jealous Husband. Illustrated with A Great Variety of Remarkable Incidents, Exceeding Pleasant and Profitable, Tending to Promote Virtue and Honour. Written Originally in Spanish, By the Inimitable Cervantes, Author of Don Quixot. Translated by Mr. Tho. Shelton. A New Edition: Revised and Compared with the Original by Mr. Mendez: With a Preface, Giving an Account of the Work*. London: Printed for and Sold by C. Hitch in Pater-noster Row, S. Bert in Ave-mary Lane, J. Brindley, H. Chapelle, and W. Shropshire in New Bond-street, and J. Atkinson in Lincoln's-inn Square, 1743.

Colman the Younger, George. *Blue-Beard; Or, Female Curiosity! A Dramatick Romance; First Represented at the Theatre Royal Drury Lane, on Tuesday January 16, 1798*. Dublin: Printed by William Porter, Grafton-Street, 1798.

Cooper, J. *The Oriental Moralist; or the Beauties of the Arabian Nights Entertainments, Translated from the Original and Adopted with Suitable Reflections Adapted to Each Story*. London: Newbery, 1791.

Danchin, Pierre, ed. *The Prologues and Epilogues of the Restoration 1660-1700*. 6 vols. Nancy: Presses universitaires de Nancy, 1981.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origins of Species*. Edited by Gillian Beer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Davenant, William. *The Siege of Rhodes: A Critical Edition*. Edited by Ann-Mari Hedbäck. Stockholm: Uppsala, 1973.

Descartes, René. *The Passions of the Soule in Three Books the First, Treating of the Passions in Generall, and Occasionally of the Whole Nature of Man. The Second, of the Number, and Order of the Passions, and the Explication of the Six Primitive Ones. The Third, of Particular Passions. By R. Des Cartes. And*

Translated out of French into English. London: Printed for A.C. and are to be sold by J. Martin, and J. Ridley, at the Castle in Fleetstreet near Ram-Alley, 1650.

Dibdin, Charles. *The Magic of Orosmanes; Or, Harlequin Slave and Sultan: A Pantomime, Drawn from the Arabian Legends*. London, 1785.

———. *The Padlock: A Comic Opera: As It Is Perform'd by His Majesty's Servants at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane*. London: Printed for W. Griffin, at Garrick's Head, in Catharine Street, Strand, 1768.

Dryden, John. "Essay on Translated Verse." In *Of Dramatick Poesy and Other Essays*, edited by George Watson, 2:20. London: Everyman's Library, 1967.

———. "Preface to Ovid's Epistles (1680)." In *The Works of John Dryden*, edited by Edward Niles Hooker and H.T. Swedenberg, Jr., 17:114. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956.

Goldsmith, Oliver. "An Essay on the Theatre; Or, A Comparison between Laughing and Sentimental Comedy." *The Westminster Magazine*, January 1773.

Gough, Richard, ed. *Arabian Nights Entertainments. Translated into French from the Arabian MSS. by Antoine Galland...and Now Rendered into English*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: Longman, 1798.

Griffith, Richard. *Variety; a Comedy, in Five Acts: As It Is Performed at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane.* London: Printed for T. Becket, Adelphi, Strand, Bookseller to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and their Royal Highnesses The Princes, 1782.

Hale, Sir Matthew. *History of the Pleas of the Crown*, 1736.

Haywood, Eliza. *The Mercenary Lover: Or, The Unfortunate Heiresses. Being a True Secret History of a City Amour. By the Author of* Reflections on the Various Effects of Love. *The Third Edition. To Which Is Added, The Padlock: Or, No Guard without Virtue. A Novel.* Third. London: Printed for N. Dobb, in the Strand: And sold by the Booksellers of London and Westminster, 1728.

Hazlitt, William. "On Actors and Acting." *Examiner*. January 5, 1817.

Hill, Aaron. *Alzira. Or Spanish Insult Repented: A Tragedy. As It Is Acted At the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane*. London, 1744.

———. *The Tragedy of Zara. As It Is Acted at the Theatre-Royal, in Drury-Lane, by His Majesty's Servants*. London: J. Watts, 1736.

Hume, David. *A Dissertation on the Passions*. Edited by Tom L. Beauchamp. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007.

———. *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*. Edited by Eugene F. Miller. Revised. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1985.

Johnson, Richard. *The Oriental Moralist, or The Beauties of the Arabian Nights Entertainments, Consisting of the Most Entertaining Stories*. London: 1791, n.d.

Johnson, Samuel. "Prefaces to the Works of the English Poets: Dryden." In *The Major Works*, edited by Donald Greene, 723. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Jonson, Ben. "To the Memory of My Beloved the Author, Mr. William Shakespeare." In *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, edited by Stephen Greenblatt, Barbara K. Lewalski, George Logan, and Katharine Eisaman Maus, Vol. B. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 2012.

Lennep, W. Van, Emmett L. Avery, Arthur H. Scouten, G.W. Stone, and C.B. Hogan, eds. *The London Stage, 1660-1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments and Afterpieces, Together with Casts, Box-Receipts and Contemporary Comment. Compiled from the Playbills, Newspapers and Theatrical Diaries of the Period.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1960.

Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Edited by Kenneth P. Winkler. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1996.

Kames, Henry Home, Lord. *Elements of Criticism*. 2 vols. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 2005.

Mack, Robert L., ed. *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Manley, Delarivier. *Almyna: Or, The Arabian Vow. A Tragedy. As It Is Acted at the Theatre Royal in the Hay-Market, by Her Majesty's Servants*. London: Printed for William Turner, at the Angel at Lincoln-Inn back-Gate; and Egbert Sanger, at the Post-House at the Middle-Temple Gate in Fleetstreet, 1707.

Miller, James, and James Hoadley. *Mahomet the Imposter. A Tragedy as It Is Acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane, by His Majesty's Servants. By Mr. Voltaire*. Edinburgh: Printed by J. Baillie and Company, 1755.

"Mirror, Volume 1." Adam Matthew Digital, 1779. http://www.18thcjournals.amdigital.co.uk/Documents/Details/Mirror, Volume 1.

Montagu, Elizabeth. *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Shakespear, Compared with the Greek and French Dramatic Poets. With Some Remarks Upon the Misrepresentations of Mons. de Voltaire*. London: J. Dodsley, Baker and Leigh, J. Walter, T. Cadell, J. Wilkie, 1769.

O'Keeffe, John. *Recollections of the Life of John O'Keeffe, Written by Himself*. 2 vols. London: Henry Colburn, 1826.

———. *The Little Hunch-Back; Or, a Frolic in Bagdad*. London: Printed for J. Debrett, 1789.

———. *The Pantomime of Aladin, or the Wonderful Lamp; as Perform'd with Universal Applause at the Theatre Royal, Covent Garden: The Poetry by J. O'Keefe Esq. the Music Selected from the Works of Handel, Giordini, Gluck, Carolan, & Shield, by Mr. A Shaw, the Songs by W. Shield*. London: Printed for G. Goulding, Haydn's Head, No. 6 James Street, Covent Garden, and No. 113 Bishopgate Street, n.d.

———. *The Recitatives, Airs, Choruses, &c. in Aladin [sic]; Or, The Wonderful Lamp. A Pantomime Entertainment. Performed at the Theatre-Royal, Covent-Garden. Music Composed by Mr. Shield. Second Edition*. London: Printed for T. Cadell, in the Strand, 1788.

Orrey, Roger Boyle Earl of. "The Tragedy of Mustapha, the Son of Solyman the Magnificent. Written by the Right Honourable the Earl of Orrey." In *The History of Henry the Fifth. And the Tragedy of Mustapha, Son of Solyman the Magnificent. As They Were Acted at His Highness the Duke of York's Theater. Written by the Right Honourable the Earl of Orrery*. London: Printed for H. Herringman, at the Sign of the Blew Anchor in the Lower Walk of the New Exchange, 1669.

Peeping Tom. "On the Minor Theatres." *Theatrical Inquisitor, and Monthly Mirror*. January 1819, Vol. 14, Iss. 78 edition.

Pope, Alexander. "An Essay on Criticism." In *Poetry and Prose of Alexander Pope*, edited by Aubry Williams. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1969.

———. "Preface." In *The Illiad of Homer*, xlii. London, 1715.

Prior, Matthew. *An English Padlock*. London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1705.

Reeve, Clara. *The Progress of Romance, through Times, Countries, and Manners; with Remarks on the Good and Bad Effects of It, on Them Respectively; in a Course of Evening Conversations. By C. R. Author of the English Baron, The Two Mentors, &c. In Two Volumes.* 2 vols. Dublin: Printed for Messrs. Price, Exshaw, White, Cash Colbert, Marchbank and Porter, 1785.

"Report from the Select Committee on Dramatic Literature: With the Minutes of Evidence." London: House of Commons, August 2, 1832.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract and Discourses*. Translated by G.D.H. Cole. London and Toronto: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1923.

Scott, Jonathan, trans. *The Arabian Nights Entertainments, Carefully Revised and Occasionally Corrected from the Arabic. To Which Is Added, a Selection of New Tales, Now First Translated from the Arabic Originals. Also an Introduction and Notes, with Engravings from Printings by Smirke.* 6 vols. London: Longman, urst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, 1811.

Scudéry, Madeleine de. *Ibrahim, Or, The Illustrious Bassa, an Excellent New Romance, the Whole Work in Four Parts. Written in French by Monsieur de Scudery and Now Englished by Henry Cogan, Gent.* London: Printed for Humphrey Moseley, at the Princes Armes in St. Pauls Church-yard; William Bentley, and Thomas Heath, in Covent-Garden, 1652.

Settle, Elkanah. *Ibrahim the Illustrious Bassa. A Tragedy. Acted at the Duke's Theatre. Written by Elkanah Settle, Servant to His Majesty.* London: Printed for T. M. for W. Cademan, at the Popes-Head in the Lower Walk of the New Exchange in the Strand, 1677.

Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, Third Earl of. *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times.* Edited by Lawrence E. Klein. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra.* New York: Washington Square Press, 1999.

———. *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark. A Tragedy. By William Shakespear. Collated with the Best Editions.* London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, 1743.

———. *Othello.* Edited by E.A.J. Honigmann. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 1997.

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, and George Colman the Younger. *The Forty Thieves: A Grand Romantic Drama.* London: Printed by J. Duncombe, 1806.

Smith, Adam. *Theory of Moral Sentiments.* Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, 1984.

Steele, Richard. "No. 14 Will's Coffee-House, May 11." *The Tatler. By Isaac Bickerstaff Esq.* May 11, 1709, Printed and Sold by John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall edition.

Voltaire. *La Tragédie de Sémiramis.* Dublin: Imprimé chez S. Powell, en Crane-Lane., 1750.

———. *Oedipe, Tragedie. Par Monsieur de Voltaire.* A Paris: Chez Pierre Ribou, Quay des Augustins, vis-à-vis la descente du Pont-Neuf, à l'Image saint Louis. Au Palais, chez Pierre Huet, sur le second Perron de la Ste Chapelle, au Soleil Levant. Jean Mazuel, au Palais, et Antoine-Urbain Coustelier, Quay des Augustins., 1719.

———. *Zaïre.* Edited by Jean Goldzink. Paris: GF Flammarion, 2004.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Edited by Anne K. Mellor and Noelle Chao. New York: Pearson, 2007.

The Whitehall Evening Post; Or, London Intelligencer. October 21, 1766.

Calcutta Gazette; Or, Oriental Advertiser. December 15, 1785.

Secondary and Theoretical Sources

Akalin, Esin. *Staging the Ottoman Turk: British Drama, 1656-1792*. Stuttgart: Ibidem Press, 2016.

Alderson, Brian. "Scheherazade in the Nursery." In *The Arabian Nights in English Literature: Studies in the Reception of The Thousand and One Nights into British Culture*, edited by Peter Caracciolo. London: Macmillan Press, 1988.

Allain, Mathé. "Voltaire et la fin de la tragédie classique française." *The French Review* 39, no. 3 (1965): 384–93.

Anderson, Emily Hodgson. *Eighteenth-Century Authorship and the Play of Fiction: Novels and the Theater, Haywood to Austen*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Andrea, Bernadette. *English Women Staging Islam, 1696-1707*. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2012.

———. *Women and Islam in Early Modern English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Aravamudan, Srinivas. *Enlightenment Orientalism: Resisting the Rise of the Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

———. "The Adventure Chronotope and the Oriental Xenotrope: Galland, Sheridan, and Joyce Domesticate *The Arabian Nights*." In *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and*

West, edited by Saree Makdisi and Felicity A. Nussbaum, 235–63. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

———. *Tropicopolitans: Colonialism and Agency, 1688-1804*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.

Ayres, Philip. *Classical Culture and the Idea of Rome in Eighteenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Babcock, R.W. "The English Reaction against Voltaire's Criticism of Shakespeare." *Studies in Philology* 27, no. 4 (1930): 609–25.

Backscheider, Paula R. "From the Emperor of the Moon to the Sultan's Prison." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 43 (2014): 1–26.

Bailes, Melissa. "Literary Plagiarism and Scientific Originality in the 'Trans-Atlantic Wilderniss' of Goldsmith, Aikin, and Barbauld." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 49, no. 2 (2016): 265–79.

Ballaster, Ros. *Fabulous Orients: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———. "Playing the Second String: The Role of Dinarzade in Eighteenth-Century English Fiction." In *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*, edited by Saree Makdisi and Felicity A. Nussbaum. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

———. "The Sea-Born Tale: Eighteenth-Century English Translations of *The Thousand and One Nights* and the Lure of Elemental Difference." In *Scheherazade's Children: Global Encounters with the Arabian Nights*, edited by Philip F. Kennedy and Marina Warner, 27–52. New York: New York University Press, 2013.

Barnette, Jane. *Adapturgy: The Dramaturg's Art and Theatrical Adaptation*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2017.

Bate, Jonathan. *Shakespearean Constitutions: Politics, Theatre, Criticism, 1730-1830*, n.d.

———. *Shakespeare and the English Romantic Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Beach, Adam R. "Aubin's *The Noble Slaves*, Montagu's Spanish Lady, and English Feminist Writing about Sexual Slavery in the Ottoman World." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 29, no. 4 (2017): 583–606.

Bekkaoui, Khalid. "White Women and Moorish Fancy in Eighteenth-Century Literature." In *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*, edited by Saree Makdisi and Felicity A. Nussbaum, 153–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Belcher, Wendy Laura. *Abyssinia's Samuel Johnson: Ethiopian Thought in the Making of an English Author*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Benedict, Barbara M. "The Curious Genre: Female Inquiry in Amatory Fiction." *Studies in the Novel* 30, no. 2 (1998): 194–210.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Task of the Translator." In *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Leon Wieseltier, 69–82. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Bergmann, Fred. "Garrick's *Zara*." *PMLA* 74, no. 3 (1959): 225–32.

Bergson, Henri. *Laughter: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic*. New York: Macmillan Press, 1914.

Birchwood, Matthew. *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2007.

Bowers, Toni. *Force or Fraud: British Seduction Stories and the Problem of Resistance, 1660-1760*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Bratton, Jacky. *New Readings in Theatre History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Brown, Laura. *Ends of Empire: Women and Ideology in Early Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

———. *English Dramatic Form, 1660-1760: An Essay in Generic History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.

Brown, Wallace Cable. "The Near East in English Drama, 1775-1825." *The Journal of English and German Philology* 46, no. 1 (1947): 63–69.

Bruce, Harold Lawton. "Voltaire on the English Stage." *Modern Philology* 8, no. 1 (1918): 1–152.

Burke, Helen M. *Riotous Performances: The Struggle for Hegemony in the Irish Theatre, 1712-1784*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003.

———. "The Catholic Question, Print Media, and John O'Keeffe's *The Poor Soldier* (1783)." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 27, no. 3–4 (2015): 419–48.

———. "The Revolutionary Prelude: The Dublin Stage in the Late 1770s and Early 1780s." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 22, no. 3 (1998): 7–16.

Burwick, Frederick. "Georgian Theories of the Actor." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

———. *Playing to the Crowd: London Popular Theater, 1780-1830*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Cahill, Samara Anne. *Intelligent Souls?: Feminist Orientalism in Eighteenth-Century English Literature*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2019.

Canfield, J. Douglas. "The Significance of the Restoration Rhymed Heroic Play." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 13, no. 1 (1979): 49–62.

Carlson, Martin. *Voltaire and the Theatre of the Eighteenth Century*. Westport and London: Greenwood Press, 1998.

Cherpack, Clifton. "Love and Alienation in Voltaire's *Zaïre*." *French Forum* 2 (1977): 47–57.

Choudhury, Mita. *Interculturalism and Resistance in the London Theater, 1660-1800*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2000.

Cohen, Ashley L. "Wage Slavery, Oriental Despotism, and Global Labor Management in Maria Edgeworth's *Popular Tales*." *The Eighteenth Century: Theory and Interpretation* 55, no. 2–3 (2014): 193–215.

Colley, Linda. *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1660-1850*. New York: Random House, 2002.

Cook, Daniel, and Nicholas Seager, eds. *The Afterlives of Eighteenth-Century Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Davis, Jim. "Looking Towards 1843 and the End of Monopoly." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, edited by Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor, 156–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Dawson, Deidre. "Is Sympathy so Surprising? Adam Smith and French Fictions of Sympathy." *Eighteenth-Century Life* 15, no. 1 (1991): 147–61.

Dent, Edward J. *Foundations of English Opera: A Study of Musical Drama in England During the Seventeenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." Translated by Avital Ronell. *Critical Inquiry* 7, no. 1 (1980): 55–81.

Deutsch, Helen E. *Resemblance and Disgrace: Alexander Pope and the Deformation of Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Dircks, Phyllis T. *The Eighteenth-Century English Burletta*. Victoria, BC: University of Victoria, 1999.

Dobie, Madeleine. "Translation in the Contact Zone: Antoine Galland's *Mille et Une Nuits: Contes Arabes*." In *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*, edited by Saree Makdisi and Felicity A. Nussbaum, 25–49. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Dobson, Michael. "Adaptation and Revivals." In *The Cambridge Companion to English Restoration Theatre*, edited by Deborah Payne Fisk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

———. *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation and Authorship, 1660-1769*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Dubedout, E.J. "Shakespeare et Voltaire: 'Othello' et 'Zaïre.'" *Modern Philology* 3, no. 3 (1906): 305–16.

Dykstal, Timothy. "Provoking the Ancients: Classical Learning and Imitation in Fielding and Collier." *College Literature* 31, no. 3 (2004): 102–22.

Eger, Elizabeth. "'Out Rushed a Female to Protect the Bard': The Bluestocking Defense of Shakespeare." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 65, no. 1/2 (2002): 127–51.

Fairer, David. "'All Manag'd for the Best': Ecology and the Dynamics of Adaptation." In *Citizens of the World: Adapting in the Eighteenth Century*, edited by Kevin L. Cope and Samara Anne Cahill, xxv – xlviii. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2015.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *The Ottoman Empire and the World Around It*. New York: I.B. Tauris & Co., 2004.

Frow, Gerald. *"Oh, Yes It Is!" A History of Pantomime*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1985.

Fuchs, Barbara. *Romance*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Galland, Antoine. "Preface to *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*." In *In Praise of Fiction: Prefaces to Romances and Novels, 1650-1760*, edited by Baudouin Millet, 210. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.

Garcia, Humberto. *Islam and the English Enlightenment, 1670-1840*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Garganigo, Alex. "The Heroic Drama's Legend of Good Women." *Criticism* 45, no. 4 (2003): 483–505.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Dubinsky. Lincoln: Nebraska University Press, 1997.

Ghazoul, Ferial J. *Nocturnal Poetics: The Arabian Nights in Comparative Context*. Cairo: The American University in Cairo Press, 1996.

Gidal, Eric. "'A Gross and Barbarous Composition': Melancholy, National Character, and the Critical Reception of *Hamlet* in the Eighteenth Century." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 39 (2010): 235–61.

Griffel, Margaret Ross. *Operas in English: A Dictionary*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2013.

Grotzfeld, Heinz. "Creativity, Random Selection, and *Pia Fraus*: Observations on Compilation and Transmission of the *Arabian Nights*." In *The Arabian Nights in Transnational Perspective*, edited by Urich Marzolph. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2007.

———. "Neglected Conclusions of the *Arabian Nights*: Gleanings in Forgotten and Overlooked Recensions." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 16 (1985): 73–87.

Gunny, Ahmad. *The Prophet Muhammad in French and English Literature, 1650 to the Present*. Markfield, UK: The Islamic Foundation, 2010.

Hermansson, Casie E. *Bluebeard: A Reader's Guide to the English Tradition*. Jackson, MI: University of Mississippi Press, 2009.

Hernandez, Alex Eric. "Tragedy and the Economics of Providence in Richardson's *Clarissa*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 22, no. 4 (2010): 599–630.

Higgins, Andrew. "Blame It on Voltaire: Muslims Ask French to Cancel 1741 Play; Alpine Village Riles Activists by Letting Show Go On; Calling on the Riot Police." *Wall Street Journal*, March 6, 2006, Eastern edition. https://search.proquest.com/docview/399063463?accountid=14512.

Highfill, Phillip H., and Edward A. Langhans, eds. *A Biographical Dictionary of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers & Other Stage Personnel in London, 1660-1800*. 16 vols. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975.

Hitt, Sarah Jayne. "The Story of Mustapha in History and Drama, 1588-1739." *Restoration and Eighteenth-Century Theatre Research* 21, no. 2 (2006): 24–39.

Howe, Elizabeth. *The First English Actresses: Women and Drama, 1660-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Hoxby, Blair. *What Was Tragedy? Theory and the Early Modern Canon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Hume, David. *A Treatise on Human Nature*. Edited by L.A. Selby-Bigge. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Hume, Robert D. *The Development of English Drama in the Late Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Adaptation*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Hyam, Ronald. *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914: A Study of Empire and Expansion*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd., 1976.

Irwin, Robert. *The Arabian Nights: A Companion*. London: Allan Lane, 1994.

Iverson, John R. "The First French Literary Centenary: National Sentiment and the Molière Celebration of 1773." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 31 (2002): 145–68.

Jakobson, Roman. "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In *Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida*, edited by Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet, 144–51. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Johnson, Rebecca, Richard Maxwell, and Katie Trumpener. "The *Arabian Nights*, Arab-European Literary Influence, and the Lineages of the Novel." *Modern Language Quarterly*, Globalism on the Move, 68, no. 2 (2007): 243–79.

Knipp, C. "The *Arabian Nights* in England: Galland's Translation and Its Successors." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 5 (1974): 44–54.

Krappe, Alexander Haggerty. "The Source of Voltaire's 'Zaïre.'" *Modern Language Review* 20, no. 3 (1925): 305–9.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue, and Novel." In *The Kristeva Reader*, edited by Tori Moi. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.

Kugler, Emily M.N. *Sway of the Ottoman Empire on English Identity in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Kusch, Manfred. "Old Certainties and the 'New Novel': The Problem of Authority in Voltaire's Theater and Prose Fiction." *French Forum* 9, no. 2 (1984): 190–99.

Kuti, Elizabeth. "Scheherazade, *Bluebeard*, and Theatrical Curiosity." In *Scheherazade's Children: Global Encounters with the Arabian Nights*, edited by Philip F. Kennedy and Marina Warner, 322–46. New York: New York University Press, 2013.

Lamb, Jonathan. *The Evolution of Sympathy in the Long Eighteenth Century*. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2009.

Lancaster, Henry Carrington. *French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire, 1715-1774*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1950.

Larzul, Sylvette. "Further Considerations on Galland's *Mille et Une Nuits*: A Study of the Tales Told by Hannâ." In *The Arabian Nights in Transnational Perspective*, edited by Urich Marzolph, 17–31. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2007.

Lawrenson, Sonja. "Frances Sheridan's *The History of Nourjahad* and the Sultan of Smock-Alley." *Eighteenth-Century Ireland / Iris an Dá Chultúr* 26 (2011): 24–50.

Levin, Paul T. *Turkey and the European Union: Christian and Secular Images of Islam*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Lewis, Bernard. *Race and Slavery in the Middle East: An Historical Enquiry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Lounsbury, Thomas. *Shakespeare and Voltaire*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

Macdonald, Duncan B. "A Biographical and Literary Study of the First Appearance of the *Arabian Nights* in Europe." *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 2, no. 4 (1932): 387–420.

Macguire, Nancy Klein. *Regicide and Restoration: English Tragicomedy, 1660-1671*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Mack, Robert L. "Cultivating the Garden: Antoine Galland's *Arabian Nights* in the Traditions of English Literature." In *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*, edited by Saree Makdisi and Felicity A. Nussbaum. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Makdisi, Saree. *Making England Western: Occidentalism, Race and Imperial Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.

Makdisi, Saree, and Felicity Nussbaum, eds. *The Arabian Nights in Historical Context: Between East and West*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Marsden, Jean I. *Fatal Desire: Women, Sexuality, and the English Stage, 1660-1720*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

———. *The Re-Imagined Text: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Eighteenth-Century Literary Theory*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1995.

Matar, Nabil. *Turks, Moors, and Englishmen in the Age of Discovery*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Mayer III, David. *Harlequin in His Element: The English Pantomime, 1806-1836*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Mazzeo, Tilar J. *Plagiarism and Literary Property in the Romantic Period*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

McGirr, Elaine. *Heroic Mode and Political Crisis, 1660-1745*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2009.

McNeff, Heather. "Finding Happiness: Interfaith Marriage in British Literature, 1745-1836." PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2013.

Milling, Jane. "'For Without Vanity, I'm Better Known': Restoration Actors and Metatheatre on the Restoration Stage." *Theatre Survey* 52, no. 1 (2011): 59–82.

Moody, Jane. *Illegitimate Theatre in London, 1770-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Mounsey, Chris. "Thomas Sheridan and the Second Smock Alley Theatre Riot, 1754." *New Hibernia Review/ Iris Éireannach Nua* 4, no. 3 (2000): 65–77.

Naddaff, Sandra. *Arabesque: Narrative Structure and the Aesthetics of Repetition in 1001 Nights*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1991.

Newey, Katherine. "The 1832 Select Committee." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, edited by Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor, 142–54. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Ng, Su Fang. "Delariviere Manley's *Almyna* and Dating the First Edition of the English *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*." *English Language Notes* 40, no. 3 (2003): 19–26.

Novak, Maximillian E. "The Politics of Shakespeare Criticism in the Restoration and Early Eighteenth Century." *ELH* 81, no. 1 (2014): 115–42.

Nussbaum, Felicity. "Between 'Oriental' and 'Black So Called,' 1688-1788." In *The Postcolonial Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Colonialism and Postcolonial Theory*, edited by Daniel Carey and Lynn Festa. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Nussbaum, Felicity A. "Dumb Virgins, Blind Ladies, and Eunuchs: Fictions of Defect." In *"Defects": Engendering the Modern Body*, edited by Helen E. Deutsch and Felicity A. Nussbaum. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000.

———. *Rival Queens: Actresses, Performance, and the Eighteenth-Century British Theater*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

———. "Slavery, Blackness, and Islam: The *Arabian Nights* in the Eighteenth Century." In *Slavery and the Cultures of Abolition: Essays Marking the Bicentennial of the British Abolition Act of 1807*, edited by Brycchan Carey and Peter Kitson, 150–72. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2007.

———. "The Challenge of Tragedy." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, edited by Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor, 368–81. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

———. "The Unaccountable Pleasure of Eighteenth-Century Tragedy." *PMLA* 129, no. 4 (2014): 688–707.

———. *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality, and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Nuss, Melynda. *Distance, Theatre, and the Public Voice, 1750-1850*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

O'Brien, John. *Harlequin Britain: Pantomime and Entertainment, 1690-1760*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

O'Quinn, Daniel. *Engaging the Ottoman Empire: Vexed Mediations, 1690-1815*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019.

———. *Staging Governance: Theatrical Imperialism in London, 1770-1800*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

———. "Theatre, Islam, and the Question of Monarchy." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, edited by Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor, 638–55. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Orr, Bridget. *Empire on the English Stage, 1660-1714*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

———. "Empire, Sentiment, and Theatre." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre, 1737-1832*, edited by Julia Swindells and David Francis Taylor. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

———. "Galland, Georgian Theatre, and the Creation of Popular Orientalism." edited by Felicity A. Nussbaum and Saree Makdisi. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Özgüles, Muzzafer. *The Woman Who Built the Ottoman World*. New York: I.B. Tauris & Co., 2017.

Park, Judy H. "The Limits of Empire in Davenant's *The Siege of Rhodes*." *Mediterranean Studies* 24, no. 1 (2016): 47–76.

Pemble, John. *Shakespeare Goes to Paris: How the Bard Conquered France*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2005.

Pepys, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*. Edited by Henry B. Wheatley. London: George Bell and Sons, 1905.

Phelan, Peggy. *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Pierce, Leslie P. *Empress of the East: How a European Slave Girl Became Queen of the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Basic Books, 2017.

———. *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Pike, Robert E. "Fact and Fiction in *Zaïre*." *PMLA* 51, no. 3 (1936): 436–39.

Pinnock, Andrew, and Bruce Wood. "A Mangled Chime: The Accidental Death of the Opera Libretto in Civil War England." *Early Music* 36, no. 2 (2008): 265–84.

Price, L. Brian. "Spatial Relationships in Voltaire's *Zaïre*." *The French Review* 50, no. 2 (1976): 251–59.

Purinton, Marjean D. "George Colman's *The Iron Chest* and *Blue-Beard* and the Pseudoscience of Curiosity Cabinets." *Victorian Studies* 49, no. 2 (2007): 250–57.

Ragussis, Michael. *Theatrical Nation: Jews and Other Outlandish Englishmen in Georgian Britain*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Reeves, Minou. *Muhammad in Europe*. Reading: Garnet, 2000.

Rich, Adrienne. "When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision." *College English* 34, no. 1 (1972): 18–30.

Ritchie, Fiona. *Women and Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Ritchie, Fiona, and Peter Sabor, eds. *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Roach, Joseph. *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.

Rosenthal, Laura J. *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Sabbagh, Karl. "The *Arabian Nights* in British Pantomime." In *Scheherazade's Children: Global Encounters with the Arabian Nights*, edited by Philip F. Kennedy and Marina Warner, 265–73. New York: New York University Press, 2013.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

———. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978.

Sanders, Julie. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

Semmens, Richard. *Studies in English Pantomime, 1712-1733*. Hillsdale, NY: Pendragon Press, 2016.

Shaw, Sheila. "Early English Editions of the *Arabian Nights*: Their Value to Eighteenth-Century Literary Scholarship." *Muslim World* 49 (1959): 232–38.

———. "The Rape of Gulliver: Case Study of a Source." *PMLA* 90, no. 1 (1975): 62–68.

Sheldon, Esther K. *Thomas Sheridan of Smock-Alley*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Solomon, Diana. *Prologues and Epilogues of Restoration Theater*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2013.

Stone, Harriet. "Scudéry's Theater of Disguise: The Orient in *Ibrahim*." *L'Esprit Créateur* 32, no. 3 (1992): 51–61.

Stott, Andrew McConnell. *The Pantomime Life of Joseph Grimaldi: Laughter, Madness and the Story of Britain's Greatest Comedian*. Edinburgh: Canongate Books, 2009.

Straznicky, Marta. "Reading the Stage: Margaret Cavendish and Commonwealth Closet Drama." *Criticism* 37, no. 3 (1995): 355–90.

Stretton, Tim, and Krista J. Kesselring. "Introduction: Coverture and Continuity." In *Married Women and the Law: Coverture in England and the Common Law World*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2013.

Taylor, Gary. *Reinventing Shakespeare: A Cultural History from the Restoration to the Present*. New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989.

Terry, Richard. *The Plagiarism Allegation in English Literature from Butler to Sterne*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Thompkins, Joanne, ed. "Special Issue: Adaptation." *Theatre Journal* 66, no. 4 (2014): 499–654.

Thorp, Jennifer. "From Scaramouche to Harlequin: Dances 'in Grotesque Characters' on the London Stage." In *The Lively Arts of the London Stage, 1675-1725*, edited by Kathryn Lowerre, 113–27. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014.

Toledano, Ehud R. *Slavery and Abolition in the Ottoman Middle East*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Tomlinson, Sophie. *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Tomlinson, Tracey E. "The Restoration English History Plays of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrey." *SEL Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 43, no. 3 (2003): 559–77.

Trumpener, Katie. "Rewriting Roxane: Orientalism and Intertextuality in Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes* and Defoe's *The Fortunate Mistress*." *Stanford French Review* 11, no. 2 (1987): 177–91.

Vasconcellos, Colleen A. *Slavery, Childhood, and Abolition in Jamaica, 1788-1838*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2015.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Walking, Andrew R. *Masque and Opera in England, 1656-1688*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Warner, Marina. *Stranger Magic: Charmed States and the Arabian Nights*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2013.

Weber, Caroline. "Voltaire's *Zaïre*: Fantasies of Infidelity, Ideologies of Faith." *South Central Review* 21, no. 2 (2004): 42–62.

Wheeler, Roxann. *The Complexion of Race: Categories of Difference in Eighteenth-Century British Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000.

White, Eric Walter. *A History of English Opera*. London: Faber and Faber, 1983.

———. *The Rise of English Opera*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.

Willie, Rachel. *Staging the Revolution: Drama, Reinvention and History, 1647-72*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015.

Wilson, Brett. *A Race of Female Patriots: Women and the Public Spirit on the British Stage, 1688-1745*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2011.

Wilson, Kathleen. "The Lure of the Other: Sheridan, Identity, and Performance in Kingston and Calcutta." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 27, no. 3 (2015): 509–34.

Wilson, Matthew R. "Speechless Spectacles: Commedia Pantomime in France, England, and the Americas during the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." In *The Routledge Companion to Commedia dell'Arte*, edited by Judith Chaffee and Olly Crick. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Winn, James Anderson. "Heroic Song: A Proposal for a Revised History of English Theater and Opera, 1656-1711." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 30, no. 2 (1997): 113–37.

Wiseman, Susan. *Drama and Politics in the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Woolf, D.R. "A Feminine Past? Gender, Genre, and Historical Knowledge in England, 1500-1800." *The American Historical Review* 102, no. 3 (1997): 645–79.

Worrall, David. *Celebrity, Performance, Reception: British Georgian Theatre as Social Assemblage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

———. *Harlequin Empire: Race, Ethnicity and the Drama of the Popular Enlightenment*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2007.

———. *Theatric Revolution: Drama, Censorship and Romantic Period Subcultures, 1773-1832*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Yermolenko, Galina I., ed. *Roxolana in European Literature, History and Culture*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

Zilfi, Madeline C., ed. *Women in the Ottoman Empire: Middle Eastern Women in the Early Modern Era*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Zipes, Jack. "Afterword." In *Arabian Nights: The Marvels and Wonders of the Thousand and One Nights*, translated by Richard Burton. New York: Signet Classics, 1991.

Zupančič, Alenka. *The Odd One In: On Comedy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008.